

DOUBLE NUMBER, PRICE 3s.

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October; the REVIEW in the other eight months.

The Classical Review

EDITORS J. T. SHEPPARD, M.A., Litt.D., King's College, Cambridge.
R. W. LIVINGSTONE, M.A., Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

L. WHIRLEY, M.A., Hon. Secretary.

PROF. GILBERT MURRAY, D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.
PROF. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

A. D. GODLEY, D.Litt., Representing the Oxford Philological Society.
PROF. SIR WILLIAM RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., B.Sc., D.L.B.A., F.B.A., Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. Wm. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;

Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, University of Toronto;

Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXXVI AUGUST-SEPTEMBER, 1922 Nos. 5, 6

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS	PAGE
PIGRIMS AND VERSIONS. H. W. J. W. MACKAIL, H. C. L. Gwynne-VAUGHAN AND F. A. WRIGHT	97
LATE BEGINNERS IN GREEK. PERCY SIMPSON	99
PINDARIC. H. W. GARROD	101
CALLIMACHEA. GILBERT A. DAVIES	103
PINDAR, PYTHIAN II. E. H. GODDARD	103
AN UNRECOGNISED EXTRACT FROM MENAN- DER'S <i>Epirneponis?</i> D. S. ROBERTSON	106
HERODAS II. 65-71. A. E. HOESMAN	109
PICUS-WHO-IS-ALSO-ZEUS. W. R. HALLIDAY	110
[Aristotle] <i>Oeconomica</i> . H. RACKMAN	112
Plato, <i>Republic</i> , 421a, Again. A. S. FERGUSON	113
Exclamatory Questions with <i>Ut</i> . S. E. WINBOLT	114
'Cor Habere' and Augustine and Virgil. J. H. BAXTER	114
The Expression 'Fons et Origo.' A. SOUTER AND J. H. BAXTER	115
Notes on Lucretius. R. J. SHACKLE	115
<i>Catalyston</i> VII. A. W. VAN BUREN	115
Some Difficulties in Ovid, <i>Faust</i> III. H. J. Rose	116
'Declamare'—KATHHEIN. F. H. COLSON	116
REVIEWS:	
The Language of Homer (Karl Meister).	
REVIEWS—continued:	
Lyra Graeca (Edmonds). E. LOBEL	120
Plotin (Heinemann). W. R. INGE	121
Menander (Loeb Edn., Allinson). T. W. LUMB	123
A Hotchpotch of All Sorts of Fishes' (Radcliffe). F. W. PEMBER	123
Greek Hero Cults (Farnell). W. R. HALLI- DAY	125
The Etruscan Alphabet (Hammarström). R. S. CONWAY	126
Cicero: <i>Pro Milone</i> , etc. (Clark). H. W. GARROD	127
Alliteration Latina (Evans). J. S. PHILLI- MORE	128
Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum (Cas- son and Brooke). J. D. BEAZLEY	130
Apicius' Cookery-Book (Giarratano and Vollmer). W. M. LINDSAY	131
Delphi (Poulsen). J. D. BEAZLEY	132
Textbook of Roman Law (Buckland). F. DE ZULUETA	134
SHORT NOTICES	135
CORRESPONDENCE	140
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	141

(The Editors request that books for review be sent, not to them direct, but to the Publishers.)

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 151-155, WEST 25TH STREET.

Price for Single Numbers, 1s. 6d. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3.
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW
18s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. A. Ormerod, 7, Grosvenor Terrace, Princes Park, Liverpool; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Professor Pearson, Trinity College, Cambridge, and Rev. G. C. Richards, Oriel College, Oxford; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Miss Hilda Livesey, 155, Oswald Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, near Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Miss F. M. Rees, The University, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 426, Woodborough Road, Nottingham; Miss P. K. Downes, Redland High School, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss C. E. Parker, Westfield College, Hampstead; Miss M. E. Pearson, University Registry, Cathays Park, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Miss M. L. Newman, 7, College Street, Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Mr. J. Whatmough, University College, Bangor; Miss M. G. Colman, High School, Tunbridge Wells; Miss D. J. L. Poole, 19, Banbury Road, Oxford; and Mr. J. W. E. Pearce, 26, Lewes Crescent, Brighton.

MURRAY'S HANDY CLASSICAL MAPS

EDITED BY G. B. GRUNDY
M.A., D.LITT.

FELLOW AND TUTOR OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, OXFORD.

"These maps of Mr. Murray's are far better than anything which has yet been attempted in the direction of teaching the physical features of ancient geography, and they deserve all attention from students and schoolmasters."

LONDON : JOHN MURRAY.

BOOKS FOR ALL EXAMINATIONS

NEW AND SECOND-HAND
CLASSICS A SPECIALITY

J. POOLE & CO.

104, CHARING CROSS ROAD
LONDON, W.C. 2.

READY SHORTLY

THE MAKING OF LATIN

By R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D.

PROFESSOR OF LATIN IN THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER; HON. FELLOW OF GONVILLE
AND CAUSS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

This little book is intended to offer to all learners and teachers of Latin a simple account of the growth of the language, so that on the one hand their Latin reading may be enriched with the fresh interest of knowing more of the original meanings of the words and idioms which they have so far known only in their conventional uses; and that on the other hand, from tracing in the case of Latin the kind of changes which are always going on in human speech, they may gain at least a glimpse of the fascinating contribution which the study of language has made to the history of the races of Italy and England, and, indeed, to our general ideas of the growth of humanity.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.1.

t and
upon
tional
(c) to
create

nnaul
of 5s.
edings
ssical
ssical
before
must

Hon.
pool ;
llege,
o the
, 155,
uden,
The
ham ;
erton,
C. E.
istry,
M. L.
llege,
M. G.
mbury

NS

DAD

the
esh
far
of
at a
the

The Classical Review

AUGUST—SEPTEMBER, 1922

EDITORIAL NOTES AND NEWS

THE *Review* has lost in Sir John Sandys a faithful friend and valued contributor. His life was one of fruitful industry, and his kindness will be held in grateful remembrance by many younger men, to whom he always gave sympathy and encouragement. A fine scholar, as his editions of many authors show, he was modest to a fault in his comment where scholars were divided. He was singularly free from the rancour which so easily besets the academic bookman. His *History of Classical Scholarship* is a record of human interest as well as of solid learning. There was something happy in the circumstances of his death, which came suddenly in the courts of his own College when he was on his way, as Orator Emeritus, to the Senate House which he loved and had adorned by the felicity of his speeches.

Bradfield was a success, in spite of rain. We congratulate the College, and look forward to the next performance. It is important that Greek plays in the original should still be produced, though we are not disposed to look with a too critical eye upon the recent ebullition of interest in Greek drama 'in English for the English.' At Glastonbury, in August, a Festival and Summer School have been held, at which Greek plays have been read in translation, the *Trachiniae* performed in English, lectures delivered, and Professor Murray's version of the *Alcestis*, produced by Mr. Boughton as a music-drama, together with Blow's *Venus and Adonis*. Best of

all, perhaps, the students have been encouraged to learn a little elementary Greek.

The resignation of Mr. Rushbrooke from the Headmastership of St. Olave's is an event which must not pass without notice here. No school better illustrates the fact that a strong Headmaster, well supported by his staff, can still maintain a classical tradition. One of Mr. Rushbrooke's former colleagues has sent us an encouraging account of the good work that can be done at school by late beginners in Greek.

It is a sign of the times that the Headmaster of Harrow should report on Speech Day that Greek is beginning to revive in his great school. At St. Paul's the High Master announced that a new form had been added to the Classical Side, because the parents are insisting on Classics for their boys. In the July *Nineteenth Century* Mr. Stewart McDowall, an experienced Science Master, who has recognised that Science by itself is not enough, pleads for Greek, to follow a good Latin preparation, on the Science Side. Everything points to a revived demand for Classics. What matters now is the provision of more teachers.

We desire to associate ourselves very warmly with the congratulations and the tributes of respect which have been paid by their many friends to Professor and Mrs. J. S. Reid on the occasion of their golden wedding-day.

THE IRISH SITUATION.

*οὐ δὴ θαυμάσιον στάσεως εἰ μήποτε λίγει
νῆσος, ἐπωνυμίαν ἦν καλέοντιν ἘΡΙΝ.*

H. W.

ROSE AYLMER: W. S. LANDOR.

Quid prosunt quae cuncta in te cumulata fuerunt
Sceptiferum genus et divinae gratia formae?
Ablatam ex oculis quis nil nisi flere relictum est
Pervigil hac saltem maerens te nocte recordor.

J. W. MACKAIL.

THREE EPIGRAMS FROM THE ANTHOLOGY.

(a) *Ἄβρότονον Θρήσσα γυνὴ πέλον · ἀλλὰ τεκέσθαι
τὸν μέγαν Ἑλληστιν φημὶ Θεμιστοκλέα.*

A. P. 7. 306.

'A Thracian wench, they called me "Love at Ease":
But still my son was great Themistocles.'

(b) *οὐ γλήχωνι Κρίτων ὁ φιλάργυρος, ἀλλὰ διχάλκῳ
ἀντὸν ἀποσφραίνει, θλιβομένου στομάχου.*

A. P. II. 165.

'When Stingy has the stomach ache
He does not pennyroyal take;
But draws a penny from his purse
And sniffs it till the pains disperse.'

(c) *ώς κῆπον τεθυκώς δεῖπνον παρέθηκεν Απελλῆς,
οἰόμενος βόσκειν ἄντι φίλων πρόβατα.
ἢν ῥαφανίς, σέρις ἦν, τῆλις, θρίδακες, πράσα, βολβοί,
ώκιμον, ἡδύοσμον, πήγανον, ἀσπάραγος.
δείσας δὲν τούτων μὴ καὶ χόρτον παραθῆ μοι,
δειπνήσας θέρμους ἡμιβρεχεῖς, ἔφυγον.*

A. P. II. 413.

'He went among his garden roots
And took a knife and cut their throats;
Then served us greenstuff, heap on heap,
As though his guests were bleating sheep.
Rue, lettuce, onion, basil, leek,
Radishes, chicory, fenugreek,
Asparagus and peppermint,
And lupines boiled—he made no stint.
At last in fear I came away:
I thought the next course would be hay.'

H. C. I. Gwynne-Vaughan.
F. A. Wright.

LATE BEGINNERS IN GREEK.

A WORKING EXPERIMENT.

It fell to my lot in the April of 1920, as one of the representatives of the English Association, to give evidence before the Prime Minister's Committee on the teaching of Greek. Incidentally I related my experience with beginners in Greek in the Fifth Form of St. Olave's Grammar School, and I afterwards drew up a memorandum on the subject. In a revised form this is printed here by the permission of the President of the Board of Education. I have checked my memories and impressions by consulting the two masters who succeeded me—Mr. T. Kingdom and Mr. W. F. Witton—and by looking at the syllabus actually in use.

The Fifth Form at St. Olave's is the first form in which it is possible to teach Greek in that school. The average age of the boys is fifteen and a half. From the experience of teaching them I strongly maintain that boys can successfully learn Greek if they begin it at this advanced age. This seems to me an important point in view of the lamentable falling off of Greek in schools at the present moment. The early study of the subject is not likely now, except in special schools or with picked boys.

Two factors contributed powerfully to the success of the venture. Before reaching the Fifth, the boys had had a good grounding in Latin, and in the Fifth they started proper Latin prose. English literature was also very helpful. It was taught with care and sympathy throughout the school, and in the higher forms it quickened literary appreciation generally.

The time devoted to Greek was one period a day. We started our first lesson in the autumn term with the Greek alphabet, a first and a second declension noun, and the present indicative active of *λύω*. Elementary composition began in the first week, with a connected paragraph of easy sentences. The books in use were Sidgwick's *First Greek Writer*, an easy Reader (Beresford or Marchant), and Thompson's *Accidence*. In the first term the boys worked through the grammar up to the contracted verbs.

The oral work ranged from pure grammar tests—such as putting *λύομεν τοὺς ιπποὺς* into the singular number—to what I may call infant dialogue based on a paragraph in Sidgwick.

From this point they moved forward, finishing the accidence and the Sidgwick in the second and third terms, and learning the elements of syntax. In the latter half of the second term they began the translation of an author. I used for this purpose the digression on the Athenian Empire in the first book of Thucydides; but my successors judged this too difficult, and substituted the story of Salamis in Philpott's Atticised *Herodotus*. The first few lessons were demonstrations in translation. The rendering into English I did myself, but accompanied it with a running fire of questions. I helped with the irregular verbs, but I expected them to tell me at sight what parts of *εἰσπλέω* and *τειχίζω* *εἰσπλέονται* and *ἐτείχισαν* were. As the work advanced, I withdrew more and more into the background, but I always looked ahead at the next lesson and helped the form over idioms or a difficult passage. They came to grief hopelessly once over *ἔστιν* *η* which I had overlooked and which, for them, completely disturbed the structure of the sentence. If a sentence was very difficult, I dictated a full rendering of it and told them to work up the accidence. The test was severe, but I believe in it. And certainly it stimulated the boys. There was in it just a touch of adventure, a sense of something to explore, which carried them forward over difficulties.

One of my successors always added some passages from the Greek Testament in the third term. I used this occasionally in the earlier stages, reading, for instance, the parable of the sower; but for working purposes I preferred to rely on Attic Greek.

In the second and (more frequently) the third term I set occasional exercises in original composition. For instance, I asked for a brief account, in Greek, of the plot of any Shakespeare play which they were reading. Their range of

vocabulary was, of course, very narrow, but they used their wits to invent expressions for ideas for which the words failed them. One boy, relating the plot of *The Tempest*, wanted to talk of 'spirits'; he fell back on *ἄνθρακες*.

From this class boys destined for higher classical study passed in their second year to the Lower Sixth—a small class in which they took 'English subjects' and mathematics with the Fifth, but otherwise they devoted themselves to Greek and Latin. They read a play of Euripides or an easy dialogue of Plato. The first term they omitted the choruses of a play, but I translated them myself; and in the third term the form took them, unless they were very difficult, with help where it was needed. If they were taking the *Alcestis*, they read *Balaustion's Adventure* for themselves; and, with readers at this stage, Professor Murray's renderings were invaluable for giving them a sense of the poetry while they were struggling with the language and the literary form.

Sidgwick's *Introduction to Greek Prose* was used in this class, and I found the preliminary sketch of Greek syntax, with its humanistic treatment, very useful as a basis for further work. It lit up the idioms which the boys met with in their reading.

Sometimes in a summer term, on extra afternoons when we failed to get a half-holiday, I put on a lesson of odds-and-ends. Subjects which I have taken in this way are—the origin of the alphabet, the staging of a Greek play, Greek sculpture with photographic or other illustrations, the geography of Athens, the equipment of the Roman soldier (with a box of lead soldiers designed in Germany), and the rhythms of the hexameter (the effect of the pause illustrated by the pauses in the blank verse of Milton). We called it by the dignified name of Archaeology, but it was anything that turned up, and it had the charm of the unexpected.

I think I may venture to say the results justified the system, even if there was an element of the hand-to-mouth about it. At any rate, it got boys up to scholarship standard. But of course the Latin was much more advanced than the Greek, and without

this firm foundation in the other ancient language success would have been impossible. Further, I always tried to make the work literary. The important thing was to create a sense of style, and here English literature helped them. I never tolerated slipshod English in translation. If a boy translated *matres familiarum*, as he invariably did the first time he met it, by 'mothers of families,' he was cured by being asked, 'Do you mean "the married women"?' I remember as a boy myself how I was struck by Wickham's rendering of *privata* in the Ode on Cleopatra by 'unqueened'; I reflected that I should have rendered it 'as a private individual.' Boys at the outset can be taught something of Latin style—and it reacts on all their work—by making them understand the order of Latin words and the construction of a Latin sentence. They are put on the alert by the old joke about the two travellers in an African forest: if the one wants to tell the other, as a vague piece of advice, that he must look out for a lion, he says '*Cave leonem*'; but if he sees the lion just coming out of a thicket, he says '*Leonem cave*'. Similarly I aimed at getting them to read a Latin sentence in the Latin order of the words, to feel their way forward intelligently instead of skipping about and 'looking for the verb,' which seemed to be their panacea for that particular trouble. It is a good plan to write on the blackboard, word by word, a Latin period of Livy, and make the class take it as it emerges before their eyes; they can even attempt to complete the unfinished clauses by stating what parts of speech are still to seek. This analytical method is very valuable, and will influence their prose.

The English literature of these forms generally reached a high standard, and an attempt was made to teach them the elements of criticism. The comparative method is of great service to the immature. If the boys read the *Alcestis*, they would write an essay on the difference between a Greek play and a play of Shakespeare. I think most of them realised that Greece, Rome, and England have all contributed to the great literature of the world.

PERCY SIMPSON.

PINDARICA.

I. THE DATE OF THE FOURTH AND FIFTH OLYMPIAN ODES.

THE old, and rather tiresome, problem of the date of the fourth and fifth Olympian Odes of Pindar acquired a new interest in 1899 by the publication of the Oxyrhynchus List of Olympian Victors (*Ox. Pap.* CCXXII. vol. ii. pp. 85 ff.). But perhaps neither the editors of the Papyrus nor the editor of the Teubner text of the Pindaric Scholia have done much to simplify the problem.

Both Odes are written for the Camarinaean Psamnis—whom the Scholia sometimes call Psammis, and twice (p. 133, 20, 21) Psamichos. *Ol. iv.* is said by the Scholia to have been written for a victory, *τεθρίππῳ*, or *ἵπποις*, or *ἄρματι*, in the year 452 (the 82nd Olympiad). This statement used to be generally impugned (*iv.* and *v.* being regarded as, both of them, written for a victory, *ἀπήνη*). But it would appear to be confirmed by the Papyrus which, against *Ol. 82*, has *σαμίου Καυ . . . τεθρίππον*. In view of the variants *Ψάμμις* and *Ψαύμιχος* in the Scholia, and the fact that the substitution of *σ* for *ψ* is a known vagary of the Kouros, it seems impossible to reject the identification of the *Σάμιος Καυ<αρίναιος>* of the Papyrus and Psamnis (Psammis, Psamichos) the Camarinaean. And if the matter ended with the fourth Olympian there would be no trouble. But the Scholia to the fifth Olympian introduce a confusion which the commentators have confounded. ‘According to the Scholia on *Ol. v.*,’ say the editors of the Papyrus, ‘Psamnis had been victorious, *τεθρίππῳ καὶ ἀπήνῃ καὶ κέλητι*: and they go on to talk of ‘Psamnis’ triple victory’ (in 452). But the MSS. of the Scholia on *Ol. v.* offer some remarkable variants. Two of Drachmann’s MSS. have, as the inscription to *Ol. v.*, *τῷ αὐτῷ ἀπήνῃ καὶ κέλητι καὶ τεθρίππῳ*. But four omit the words *καὶ τεθρίππῳ*. Three have also the following: *γέγραπται. τῷ αὐτῷ Ψαύμιδι τεθρίππῳ καὶ ἀπήνῃ καὶ κέλητι νενικηκότα τὴν πβ' Ολυμπιάδα*. But the other three reproduce this with the important variant *πε'* for *πβ'* (i.e. Olympiad 85 for 82). Olympiad 82, so far as a victory *κέλητι* is concerned, is cer-

tainly false, since we know from the Papyrus that the victor *κέλητι* in that year was, not Psamnis, but one Pytho. In face of these variants, it seems to me certain that this last scholion should read *γέγραπται τῷ αὐτῷ Ψαύμιδι τεθρίππῳ <τὴν πβ'> καὶ ἀπήνῃ καὶ κέλητι νενικηκότα τὴν πε' Ολυμπιάδα*, and that from the first the *καὶ τεθρίππῳ* of a minority of the MSS. should be deleted.

We have thus two clear and consistent statements by the Scholia: (1) That *Ol. iv.* was written for a victory *τεθρίππῳ* in 452; (2) that *Ol. v.* was written for a victory *ἀπήνη* and a victory *κέλητι* in 440. ‘For a victor’ would be more exact; for Pindar speaks only of the *ἀπήνη*, and has nothing to say of the *κέλητι*. No doubt, as editors have conjectured, the Victory Ode for the *κέλητι* event was the commission of some other poet.

The credit of the Scholia has been a good deal enhanced generally by the discovery of the Papyrus, and the date 440 for Psamnis’ second victory ought not to be set aside without good ground. Is there any ground for rejecting this date?

One of our MSS., the Ambrosian, at *Ol. v. 19d* has this note:

ὅτι δὲ περὶ τὴν π' ἐνίκησεν Ολυμπιάδα ὁ Ψαῦμις τῇ ἀπήνῃ, οὗτος συνοράται, καταλέγεται γάρ αὐτῷ τὸ ἀγώνισμα περὶ ὀγδοηκοστὴν εἰς Ολυμπιάδα. τῷ δὲ δρματὶ ἐνίκησε τὴν πβ'. ὥστε τὴν πά' Ολυμπιάδα ἐνίκησε τῇ ἀπήνῃ ὁ Ψαῦμις.

This note confirms the date 452 for the victory *τεθρίππῳ*. But it is also clear that it is drawn from the *ὑπομνήματα* of some person who knew of a victory by Psamnis *ἀπήνη*, but was not aware that he had been victorious *κέλητι* in the same year. This person can date the victory *ἀπήνη* only conjecturally. And here, as in the inscriptions to *Ol. vi. pp. 153-4D*, we get valuable evidence to the honesty of our Scholia. *Ol. v.* and *vi.* are the only Odes of Pindar written for a victory *ἀπήνη*. The Oxyrhynchus List does not record such victories; and it is likely, as the editors of the Papyrus have remarked, that those victories had no place in the more easily accessible Victory Records. And both in *Ol. vi.* and at *Ol. v. 19d* the Scholiasts confess themselves at a loss for an exact date.

The scholion just quoted, however, cannot be textually sound. It purports to infer the date 456 for *Ol.* v. from the fact that the victory of *Ol.* iv. took place in 452, while contests with the *ἀπήνη* were abolished 'about the 85th Olympiad' (*i.e.* about 440). Clearly the inference involves a complete *non sequitur*. We can only get rid of this *non sequitur* by supposing that what the Scholiast wrote was, not *πά*, but *πά* <*ἢ πγὴ ἢ πδὴ*>. That is to say, knowing the date, 452, of *Ol.* iv., and inferring its priority to v. from its place among the Odes, and holding that there was no contest *ἀπήνη* in the 85th Olympiad, he, quite logically, places *Ol.* v. in either the 81st, or 83rd, or 84th Olympiad. The Inscription to *Ol.* vi. places the abolition of the contest *ἀπήνη* in either the 85th or 86th Olympiad. Authorities, therefore, differed as to whether the 85th Olympiad was the last year in which the contest took place or the first in which it did not. But, as we have seen, the Inscription to *Ol.* v. places that Ode in the 85th Olympiad. The scholar from whose notes that Inscription is drawn might have found it as difficult as other antiquarians to find a date for a victory *ἀπήνη*. But he is aware, as the Scholiast at 19d is not, that Psamis was victorious with both *ἀπήνη* and *κέλης* in one and the same year; and the ordinary Victory Lists, therefore, would furnish him, under the victory *ἀπήνη*, with the date which he sought.

In line 8 Pindar speaks of Camarina as a *νέουκος ἔδρα*. The Scholiasts say that this refers to its refoundation by the Geloans in the 42nd Olympiad, after its destruction by Gelo; and cite Timaeus. But as Gelo destroyed the town about the year 485, the Scholiasts are patently in error, and would appear to have given the date of the original foundation of Camarina in place of its refoundation. It was founded somewhere about the 42nd Olympiad (see Thuc. VI. 5). It was destroyed in 552, refounded about fifty years later, only to be again destroyed in 485 by Gelo. How long an interval elapsed between its destruction by Gelo and its recolonisation (in which Psamis bore a part) we have no means of knowing. The date usually given is 461. But nothing

in Diodorus XI. 76 excludes a date some ten years later.

All our evidence, then, seems to me to point decisively to the year 440 as the date of the fifth Olympian. It becomes thus the latest of Pindar's Odes, written when he was close upon fourscore years old. This gives it a new interest for us; and it is only on account of this new interest that I have thought it worth while to try and probe this dull question of chronology. As is well known, this poem had no place in the 'edaphia.' Though it was recognised as Pindaric by the Alexandrians, its authenticity has been questioned by the Germans. In particular, the character of its metre has been thought to point to some other author. But perhaps anything, whether in metre or in diction, which has been thought 'un-Pindaric,' is sufficiently explained when the piece is found to belong to the poet's last years. It is Pindar's last piece; and it celebrates the last occasion in which there was a contest *ἀπήνη* at Olympia.

II. ISTHMIAN vii. 10.

*τίνι τῶν πάρος, ὡ μάκαιρα Θῆβα,
καλῶν ἐπιχωρίων μάλιστα θυμὸν τεὸν
εὐφρανας; ή ῥα . . . ἄνικ εὐρυχαταν
5 Στρειλας Διδύνοντο; . . .
8 η ἀμφὶ Τειρειλο πυκναῖς ποντοῖς βουλαῖς;
η ἀμφὶ Ίδαον ιππόμητιν;
10 η Σπαρτῶν ἀκαμαντολογχᾶν;*

The genitive in line 10 is said to depend on *θυμὸν εὐφρανας* in 2-3, and is described as the genitive of cause after verbs expressing emotion. But *εὐφράνω* is not elsewhere used with the genitive, and in line 1 it is followed by the dative. The trouble here is intensified by the intervening *ἀμφὶ, ἀμφὶ* in 8 and 9. It is difficult to conceive why Pindar should not have employed in line 10 either a dative, sorting with *τίνι* in line 1, or an accusative governed by *ἀμφὶ* in 9.

Apart from grammar, the epithet *ἀκαμαντολογχᾶν* is not apt. It does not bring before us what is distinctive in the legend of the Sparti. What is distinctive about them is, not that they were *untiring* fighters (their conflict was brief—*brevis vitae spatium sortita iuventus*, Ovid calls them: *Met.* III. 124), but that they sprang from the earth in full panoply. That is the first thing

one thinks of in connection with them—and speaks of. Thus, Euripides speaks of the λόγχη σπαρτὸς (*Syphr.* 583); and, again, in the *Phoenissae* (670) he has

Ἐνθερέ ἔξανῆκε γῆ
πάνοπλον θύμι.

So, too, Ovid (*Met.* III. 105 ff.):

glebae coepere moveri
primaque de sulcis acies apparuit hastae,
mox umeri pectusque onerataque bracchia telis
existunt crescitque seges clipeata virorum.

CALLIMACHEA.

(a) *H. VI.*, 133 :

ταῖσι δὲ Δηώ
δωσεῖ πάντ' ἐπίμεστα καὶ ὡς ποτὶ ναὸν ἰκωται

The pronoun *ταῖσι* refers to those initiated women who, owing to age or infirmity, are unable to accompany the procession all the way to Demeter's temple. If they walk as far as they can, the goddess will show them favour. But how precisely?

Stephanus, in his edition of 1577, writes: 'Puto Ἐλλέτειν hic particulam ēāv, quam subaudientem reliquerit: ut sit sensus, Ceres omnia illis cumulate dabit, et tamquam si ad ipsum usque templum venerint.' Since this view appears to have the support of Professor Mair, as well as other critics, it must receive the respect of notice; but until instances in support of the alleged omission of *ēāv* are produced, we can only acquiesce in Blomberg's comment 'quem sensum an ferat lectio vulgata, equidem nescio.' Indeed, even if there be such instances, it seems to me that in this case the preceding context has made it so clear that these women will not reach the temple, that any Greek would have written, not *ēāv* *īkōnrai*, but *ei īkōro*. In the same edition grammar is respected by Frischlin's translation: 'Ceres dabit omnia abunde plena ut etiam ad templum perveniant'; but it fails in sense, since it is clear that the aged and infirm will *not* reach the temple. And Ernesti's amended form 'utque post ad eadem ipsam veniant' (whether right or wrong in making *καὶ* a conjunction) cannot be accepted without an equivalent in the Greek for *post*. Bergk and Meineke thought to counter this objection by reading *ποτε* (*ποκα*) for *ποτὶ*; but it may still be asked why *δωσεῖ* is here followed by a final construction instead of an infinitive and whether Demeter is particularly likely to have rewarded her votaries by restoring them to health and strength.

No one seems to have paid any attention to the scholion (*ταῖσι ἀθούσαις καὶ ταῖσι μὴ ἀθούσαις* *ἴσοι*)

If Pindar, instead of calling his Sparti ἀκαμαντόλογχαι had called them ἀντόλογχαι, he would have made them like the Sparti of other poets. And I suspect that he did so, and that we should write here—

ἢ ἀμφὶ Ἰδαον ιππόμητρι
ἢ Σπαρτῶν κάμακ' αὐτολογχᾶν;

'The shaft of the Sparti who sprang to birth spear in hand' gives us at once a genuinely distinctive characterisation.

H. W. GARROD.

μισθὸν δώσει), except perhaps G. Hermann, who proposed (ap. Schneider) to read δωσεῖ πάντ' ἐπίμεσθ' ἢ καὶ αἱς ποτὶ ν. l. In the absence of explanation I can only guess that he was introducing an attraction of the relative scarcely to be justified by the examples in Kühner-Gerth, §555, n. 4. I suspect that what Callimachus wrote was δωσεῖ πάντ' ἐπίμεσθ' ὡς χαῖ ποτὶ ναὸν ἰκωται (= ὡς καὶ ἑκείνου αἱ). For the omission of ἢ compare II. 10, ὡς μν ὕδη, μέγας οὐτος. I assume an accidental transposition, perhaps facilitated by the resemblance of the abbreviations used for ὡς and καὶ. If the scribe had ἐπίμεστα unclued before him, the error would be still more natural.

(b) *Ephig.* LXIV. 3, 4:

οὕτως ὑπνώσαις, ἀδικωτάτη, ὡς τὸν ἔραστήν
κομιζεῖς, ἐλέου δ' οὐδὲν δυναρ ἥντιασας.

If this is right, the poet, as Schneider says, 'pendenti orationi substituit liberam.' The objection is not to this form, but to the sense assigned to *ἐλέου ἥντιασας*; I should as soon expect to find *ἐλέου ἦτιχες* used actively. Schneider quotes κατάλεξον ὅπως ἥντησας ὀπωπῆς (*Od.* 3. 97 = 4. 327); but (1) it is not quite clear that in Homer ὀπωπῆ is an exact synonym for ὄψις, (2) *ārvāv* is not the verb used here, and (3) one feels that an active use of ὄψις τυχέν (to get a sight of) would be much less surprising than a similar use of ἀκοή τυχέν, because, I suppose, we are accustomed to desire and receive the one but not the other. Moreover, the fact that *ārviaçew* is used of suppliants would naturally affect the poet's sense of the word's function. Liddell and Scott illustrate the use of *ārviaçew* (or, as they will have it, *ārvāv*) with the genitive pretty fully, and I fancy that anyone who examines their examples with attention will conclude that *ἐλέου ἥντιάσω* is just an alternative for *ἐλέου τυχάνω*. Boissonade's correction, *ἥντιασα*, is better on palaeographical grounds and more elegant than Hecker's *ἥντιασας*, and is doubtless right.

GILBERT A. DAVIES.

PINDAR, PYTHIAN II.

THE interpretation of Greek Lyric Poetry has made much progress in the last hundred years, but all the many explanations that have been offered of

the Second Pythian have led little further to a real understanding of the poem. It is now universally admitted that the ode is no real Epinicion, but

as to its purpose and meaning few commentators agree, and some go so far as to deny it any unity at all. Dissen says that the *motif* of the poem is to be found in ll. 57 ff. Croiset maintains that the whole is a lecture on moderation, *Xρῆ κατ' αὐτὸν ἀεὶ παντὸς ὄραν μετρόν*. F. D. Morice declares that Hiero had been acting unwisely, that he was ambitious, avaricious, and suspicious, and Pindar warns him against his faults. Luebbert makes the poem a philosophical disquisition on life. Drachmann dates the ode in 467, and makes it an attempt to heal the breach between Hiero and Pindar. Kleanthes finally refers the whole from the beginning to end to Bacchylides, and having forced the poem into this Procrustean bed, says: *οὐδεὶς δύναται νὰ εἴπῃ ὅτι η συνέχεια τῶν ἔννοιῶν οὐκ ἀριστηῖ*. It may be so, but the *ἔννοιαι* are not Pindar's.

Let us see what happens if we make the whole ode Pindarocentric. This means that Pindar wanted to talk of himself and took the opportunity of a victory to do so. The ode is a sort of letter, which it was left to Hiero's discretion to perform or not; and the introduction of so much personality is not as surprising as it would be in a genuine panegyric.

In form and matter alike we shall find that, with Pindar as the centre, the ode becomes a whole. Just because he did not want the discussion of himself to be too obvious or too blatant, much is left vague and tentative, which Hiero, with a full knowledge of the facts and seeing the abnormal quantity of First Persons used, would have little difficulty in understanding. After the invocation comes immediately the mention of Cinyras, an obvious prelude to the mention of Pindar himself. 'Cinyras is sung by the Cyprians'—'I sing you' must have been expected. Instead there is a slight change: 'The Locrians sing you in gratitude, for all wise people are grateful'—*i.e.*, 'I am not forgetting myself, and I should be a fool if I failed to learn the lesson of Ixion, who is the worst example of ingratitude, made worse by the fact that he was *ἄδητος* and did not know how to keep his place.'

This is, however, by no means the

usual interpretation of the myth, about which there are as many opinions as men. Thus Christ says it is entirely irrelevant, while the lecture on ingratitude is referred variously to the Locrians (Fennell), to others helped by Hiero (Mezger), to Hiero (Boeckh), to Anaxilas (Hermann), to Pindar himself (Thiersch, L. Schmidt).

The myth must be connected with the main thread of the ode, and we may deny at once, as against Christ, that Pindar used any myth which occurred to him or to which he took a fancy. But we must equally deny, as against Dissen, that every part of the myth must refer to some event in the history of the victor, his ancestors or his city; and we may reject the fabrications, which have appealed to many, of the prospective crimes of Hiero towards the wife of Anaxilas, to account for the introduction of Hera. A study of the myths will teach us, always remembering that there was a limited number to select from, that there is also a limited number of types: (1) The city or ancestor myth, *P.* IV., *O.* VI., etc.; (2) the 'games' myth, *N.* IX., *O.* X., etc.; (3) the 'moral lecture' myth, *P.* II., *N.* VII. In practically every case, the relevance of the myth is pointed out or hinted at at the end of the story, though sometimes the poet mentions that he has digressed, *P.* X., XI., but this does not occur in the 'moral lecture' myths.

The Ixion myth belongs to this third class. It is a lecture on gratitude. But what of its end? Does that refer to gratitude? This is a perfectly legitimate objection, but it is easily met, and we can thereby explain a further important point in the discussion of the Pindaric myths. There are some whose application changes in the middle. So here we have, first a discussion of gratitude, which leads naturally in the case of Ixion to the omnipotence of God and the need for acquiescing in His will; (and incidentally the consequence of violating it, here exemplified by the Centaurs).

The lessons which Pindar wishes us to draw are two: (a) I am not ungrateful, so let not Hiero imagine that what I am going to say is a token of it;

(b) the world is a place of ups and downs, according to God's will, as Archilochus knew and told us many times. (The mention of Archilochus is probably due to a verbal similarity in that poet's works and to the recollection of his fate (*cf.* Hauvette, *Mélanges Perrot*, 1901.) So I am not going to be spiteful, if I happen to be 'down,' but will put up with my fortune and avoid the misfortune of Archilochus, who did not realise that wisdom and good fortune are the best things we can have.

This line, whose precise meaning is doubtful, comes so abruptly that it is difficult to trace the connexion of thought exactly. We suspect that the ambiguity is due to the fact that Pindar does not feel quite comfortable in what he is saying, and this suspicion is confirmed by the irrelevant piece of flattery which follows and which the most adulatory of Pindar's enemies would find it hard to beat. It is an interlude while he plucks up courage to reach his climax. It may be that he had Xenophanes in mind and the famous retort of Hiero to him on his complaint of poverty, and Pindar may hint that his remarks are not to be taken as implying any misplaced independence or excess of sincerity. He was an honest man of course, but he did not wish to lose a valued patron. So ll. 57-71 are simply a preparation for the real object of the ode, the expostulation and apology of Pindar. Anyone who has read the poet with care must feel that he is dealing here with personal matters; *cf.* P. IX. 75-96, X. 51-64, and that the agitation of the verse is not affected. Here Kleanthes may be right and Pindar may have feared to be superseded, though there is no reason for suggesting Bacchylides or saying that Pindar was piqued at not getting the order for a poem. The final preparation for the private part of the ode, Strophe D, etc., which can be omitted and still leave the poem performable, comes with *πρεσβύτεραι βονλαί*. Anyone with a knowledge of Court etiquette must have known this was a prelude to something its author feared might give offence. When Hiero is strung up to the highest pitch, Pindar begins solemnly *γένοις ὀλος ἐστι*. 'Du sollst der werden

der Du bist,' as Nietzsche put it, slightly altering the famous *γνῶθι σεαυτόν*. The extreme knife-like sharpness of all that follows signifies its importance. *Μαθών* (which Headlam, *inter alia*, takes as qualifying the ape, though why emphasise the learning of the ape, when it does nothing to help the interpretation?) adds to the Nietzschean ideal that of the Dorian 'Erziehungsideal' (for which *cf.* Wilamowitz *Herakles*, I. 287), and being intentionally vague, is meant to imply many things, such as 'when you have learnt the truth about everything,' 'as you have taught yourself to be by developing your own nature' and so on. The definite meaning which Hiero is to bear in mind is: 'Remain at your highest level of wisdom, while you are judging me, for the matter requires a wise judge. Children, you know, call an ape beautiful; they are no judges and are taken in by all sorts of follies on the ape's part. But Rhadamanthys was quite different, for he used his wisdom wisely, so he is now free from all the deceitful wiles of the base; be like him and hope for his reward.' (Comparetti wants to take *καρπὸν φρενῶν* as meaning that Rhadamanthys has the privilege of judging the souls of the blest, but the evidence he quotes is weak, and in Pindar Rhadamanthys is not yet the judge solely of the good.)

The remainder of the ode is taken up with a self-justification and a calm conviction that he will triumph in the end. The good man has his bad times, but as the myth has told us, his bad times will end, and the wicked man will find that all his wiles do him no good, that his prosperity is insecurely established, and that he will be hoist with his own petard. If he is patient, Pindar's lot will change; only as he does not now kick against the pricks, may he always have good men for his friends.

That such is the explanation of the last passage, there can be little doubt. But it has been sadly obscured by irrelevant introductions of *πιθηκισμός*, and fox-myths from Archilochus. The fox is itself a myth in this ode, and Galen is sufficient authority to show that the mention of the ape does not imply flattery. Children, he says, are

foolish enough to find an ape a source of amusement; they lack judgment. Is not this enough without controversies, whether Hiero or the children are to be identified with the ape, and whether the children are pleased with the ape or the ape with the children? Judgment is

the key to the passage, and it is only natural that Pindar should refer to Rhadamanthys, when he wished to claim a fair decision from Hiero on a matter that required calm and dispassionate wisdom for its solution.

E. H. GODDARD.

AN UNRECOGNISED EXTRACT FROM MENANDER'S *EPITREPONTES*?

IN one of the most striking¹ passages of the *Epitrepontes* Menander has portrayed the emotions of the young husband Charisius on overhearing a dialogue between his neglected wife Pamphile and her father Smicrines. She has refused, under great pressure, to leave him, and he is overwhelmed with remorse for his treatment of her. It is not quite certain that any such scene between father and daughter² took place on the stage: but it is clear that Smicrines makes more than one attempt to carry her off, and it is unlikely that Menander refrained from staging a debate so suitable for Euripidean rhetoric. Moreover, we possess a small and mutilated fragment (*Z*) of the great Cairo papyrus which Sudhaus³ (followed by van Leeuwen and Allinson) believes to come from this very scene: these critics differ only in this, that while Sudhaus would place it in the first act, van Leeuwen and Allinson more plausibly suggest the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth. *Z* certainly contains scraps of a dialogue between a father and his protesting child, and Sudhaus seems to be right in maintaining that this child is a daughter and that her name is Pamphile. If so, the fragment is almost certainly from the *Epitrepontes*. Almost the first words

used by the father (in *Z*¹, which Sudhaus and Allinson place before the verso *Z*²) are these: *ει' δὲ καμὲ δεῖ λέγειν, | ἐτοι]-μ[ό]ς [ει']μ[ι], τρία δέ σοι προθῆσομαι.* He proceeds to elaborate his case in a *ρήσις*, which Sudhaus calculates to have been rather over forty lines long (more than half has perished). Before he can finish what he has to say, the daughter, despite his protests, retires into the house. If Sudhaus is right in his general interpretation of the passage, he is probably justified in his further inference that the father's *ρήσις* answers and balances a similar *ρήσις* delivered by the daughter at a slightly earlier point.

The object of this note is to suggest the possibility that we possess forty-four lines of Pamphile's *ρήσις*, and have possessed them unrecognised for more than forty years. I refer to the *ρήσις* contained in the Didot papyrus published with partial facsimiles by H. Weil in 1879, and included by Nauck (T.G.F.² 1889) as *frag. incert.* 953 of Euripides. The passage begins *ῳ πάτερ, ἔχον μὲν οὖν ἐγὼ λόγους λέγω | τούτους λέγειν σέ.* This papyrus, ascribed by Weil⁴ to the second or third century B.C., contains a number of extracts from tragedy and comedy, some epigrams, and some money accounts. The *ρήσις* (which is much the longest extract) is repeated, less correctly, on the back of the papyrus. The papyrus appears to ascribe the *ρήσις* to Euripides, for the second copy (that on the back) is said to be headed **ΕΤΡΕΙΠΙΔΟΤ**. The principal copy (which alone is shown in Weil's facsimile) has a mutilated heading, which Weil reads as **ΕΤΡΕΙΠΙΔΟΤ**; and at its

¹ Sudhaus² 494-547; Koerte 457-501 must be supplemented by *Ox. Pap.* X. 1236¹⁻⁹.

² The view that Pamphile is a *persona muta* has been abandoned by all recent editors. She undoubtedly appears in l. 470 ff. Sudh.³=432 ff. Koerte; cf. Jensen in *Rh. Mus.* 1910, p. 365, and Wüst in Bursian's *Jahresber.* 174, p. 203.

³ See especially *Menanderstudien*, 1914, p. 1 ff. In Koerte² *Z* is printed with *frag. incert.* before *Georgos*. Rennie (*C.R.* XXXVI, p. 79) accepts Sudhaus' view of the character of *Z*, but agrees with van Leeuwen and Allinson in putting it at a later point of the play.

⁴ Dr. E. H. Minns has kindly examined the facsimile for me, with Mr. H. I. Bell, and informs me that there is no doubt that the papyrus is earlier than 162 B.C.

conclusion stands a row of letters which Weil reads as ΕΤΡΙΠΙΔΗΣΣΜΟΔΡΕΓΑΤΗΣ. Dr. E. H. Minns informs me that when he examined the facsimile with Mr. H. I. Bell, they decided that ΕΤΡΙΠΙΔΗΣ and ΕΓΑΤΗΣ were fairly certain: with regard to the intermediate letters, they thought that Weil was wrong in reading a second Σ before the Μ; and that the letter which Weil read as Ρ was something (perhaps Ε), with Ρ or, more probably, Ι written over it. The meaning of what follows ΕΤΡΙΠΙΔΗΣ remains an enigma, and no plausible interpretation has ever been offered. Weil ascribed the passage to Euripides, and he was followed by Cobet (*Mnemosyne* VIII., 1880, p. 56), who suggested a satyric drama, F. Blass (*Rh. M.* LIII., 1880, p. 74), and also by Nauck and Kock. Wilamowitz, however (*Hermes* XV., 1880, p. 491, and *Euripides Herakles*, ed. I, I., p. 41, n. 82) and Tyrrell (*Hermathena* IV., 1881, p. 99) have argued cogently against this view. Apart from the general tone, which is surely not that of fifth-century tragedy, there are several points of metre and language unfavourable to the ascription. The most striking are the ending of l. 10, καίτοι γ', ὁ πάτερ; the elision of -αι in the last line (*πειράσομ*) for which there is only one doubtful parallel in Euripides (I.A. 407); and the untragic τυχὸν τῶς l. 9 and μέχρι l. 32.¹ Wilamowitz was so angry at the ascription to Euripides, that he refused to see any merit whatever in the passage; he regarded it as a schoolmaster's exercise, and closed his indictment with 'doch genug davon: hoffentlich für immer.' With this I cannot agree. The piece is not tragic, but it is singularly delicate and affecting, and it must be the work of a fine dramatist.

Weil adduced one piece of external evidence favourable to the view that the ρήσις is Euripidean. In the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (II. 24, 38) the following lines are quoted from an unnamed source :

Inuria abs te adjicior indigna, pater;
nam si improbum esse Chresphontem existimas
cur me huic locabas nuptiis? sin est probus
cur talem inuitam inuitum cogis linquere?

¹ But Tyrrell's suggestion that the fourth foot of l. 32 is an anapaest is baseless: the third foot is clearly a dactyl.

The only important variant is 'existimabas,' read by the inferior MSS. in l. 2. Two alternative replies by the father are given a little later, of which one at least, and probably both, are rhetorical illustrations invented by the author of the treatise.

If 'Chresphontem' is sound, this extract must be tragic, and Ribbeck prints it as fr. III. of Ennius' *Cresphontes*. Its resemblance to the Didot ρήσις is obvious, and, since Euripides wrote a *Cresphontes* (of which little is known), the ρήσις (if it is by Euripides) might be supposed to come from that play. But l. 2 of the Latin passage is metrically defective, and 'Ctesiphontem,' suggested by Wilamowitz, is perhaps as plausible as any of its rivals (for instance, 'Cressipontem,' '<hominem>', '<olim>', '[esse] . . . existimaueras').

If Euripides be rejected as the author of the ρήσις, the obvious claimant is his greatest follower, Menander:² the metre, however, at first sight, presents an obstacle. It is too free for fifth-century tragedy, but is it free enough for comedy? Tyrrell pointed to a fragment of Damoxenus' Σύντροφοι (Kock III., p. 349), which in sixty-three lines has³ very few lapses from tragic metrical standards, and the answer was sufficient for his purpose; but it is not sufficient to justify metrically the ascription of the piece to Menander himself. It is obvious that the general metrical character of the new Menandrea is extremely unlike that of the ρήσις. Yet, besides several shorter passages, there is one scene in the *Perikeiromene* (ll. 349-391), which shows conclusively that, in a Euripidean situation, Menander was prepared to be almost Euripidean for many lines on end. The scene (whose tragic character has been recognised by all critics) is an anagnorisis of father and daughter, and in forty-three

² Ll. 25, 26 of the ρήσις—τῶν μὲν ἀγαθῶν με τὸ μέρος ὃν εἶχεν λαβεῖν | τὸν συναπορθῆναι δὲ μὴ λαβεῖν μέρος resemble very closely Menander fr. 404 K (from the *Plōcium*) ll. 7, 8—τῶν μὲν ἀναράπων ἔχων | τὸ μέρος ἀνάρτων, τῶν δὲ ἀγαθῶν οὐδέν μέρος.

³ οὐδέν πρᾶγμα τὰ | γυνόμενα ll. 31, 32: but Euripides has similar breaks with οὐδεῖς: an anapaest in the second foot, l. 56: ταῦτα προσάγω at the opening of l. 57: οὐτώ συνδοκεῖ at the close of l. 67.

consecutive lines, mostly stichomythia, there is no violation of Porson's law, and only one doubtful anapaest outside the first foot.¹ It is true that the tone of this passage is different from that of the *ρήσις*—it is livelier and more suggestive of parody—but that suits the character of the speakers and the light-hearted atmosphere of the play.

It may further be pointed out that in Z¹ of the Cairo papyrus, which probably comes, as we have seen, from the close of the scene between Pamphile and Smicrines, the first nine surviving lines are in purely tragic metre; indeed the first three, two of which, at least, are spoken by the daughter, are exactly in the style of the *ρήσις*: they run ἀλλ', εἴ με σφέων τοῦτο μὴ πείσαις ἐμέ, | οὐκέτι πατὴρ κρίνοι ἀν ἀλλὰ δεσπότης. | λόγου δὲ δέιται ταῦτα καὶ συμπείσεως. If anyone may speak (in Comedy) the language of Tragedy, who so suitable as a refined heroine in extreme distress?

Apart from metrical points, the piece is admirably suited to Pamphile's situation, and its style and tone correspond strikingly to the indications given by that speech of Charisius to which reference was made at the opening of this article. The speaker of the *ρήσις* has been urged by her father to leave her husband. The first five lines are an apology for appearing to set her wits against his. The next thirteen deal with the point that her husband has done some wrong: she replies that, unless he has wronged her, it is not her business: that she is not aware that she has been wronged, and that 'have it as you will' (*εστω δ' ο βούλει*) she is perfectly satisfied. The rest of her speech answers a different line of attack. 'Kind or unkind,' the father has said, 'he is a ruined man: and I propose to remarry you to a rich one' (*ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἐμοὶ μὲν χρηστὸς ἡπόρηκε δέ,*, | *σὺ δὲ ἀνδρί μ', ὡς φήσ, ἐκδίδως νῦν*

¹ L. 385, *βραχύς τις ἀνάγλυφος*, which Sudh. claims to have read with certainty; but Menander may have scanned ἀνάγλυφος: in l. 353, where Sudh. reads *ράθιον μέγα*, only *ράθ* is certain. The opening of l. 360 is corrupt: some restorations needlessly violate tragic metre. For further tragic characteristics of this passage see P. Maass in *Rh. M.* LXVIII., 1913, p. 361. The form *ροντί* is used in l. 357.

πλουσίῳ | ἵνα μὴ διαξῶ τὸν βίον λυπου- μένη, 19 ff.). Her answer is partly an eloquent plea that she has taken him for richer, for poorer, for better, for worse: partly a Euripidean conundrum as to what is to be done if her new husband is ruined too. Must she be married to a *third*? And if he is ruined . . . ? The speech ends with a dignified protest: *εἰ δὲ μή, σὺ μὲν βίᾳ | πράξεις οὐ βούλει, τὴν δ' ἐμὴν ἐγὼ τύχην | πειράσομαι ὡς δέι μή μετ' αἰσχύνης φέρειν.*

The space given to the financial argument exactly suits Smicrines' character. He is concerned for his daughter and his ducats, but especially his ducats: he resents Charisius' plunge into debauchery as an insult to Pamphile, but what really alarms him is the dreadful expense of it, and the danger to her dowry. He is cousin to the father in the *Menaechmi*, who has no patience with his daughter's complaints of her husband's unfaithfulness, but fires up when he hears that he is giving her jewels to his mistress. This is clear all through the *Epitrepones*, and especially so in the amusing scene where Smicrines finally attempts to carry Pamphile off, only to find that everything has been comfortably settled. As he enters, he answers the protests of the nurse Sophrona with the exclamation² *ἀλλ' ἡ περιμένω καταφαγεῖν τὴν προΐκα μον | τὸν χρηστὸν αὐτῆς ἄνδρα, καὶ λόγους λέγω | περὶ τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ.* The language recalls the words of the *ρήσις*, especially—*ἀλλ' ἔστ' ἐμοὶ μὲν χρηστὸς (19)—ω πάτερ, ἔχρην μὲν οὖς ἐγώ λόγους λέγω | τούτους λέγειν σέ (1 ff.)—εἰ τάλλα κρίνειν ἔστιν ἀνότον γυνή, | περὶ τῶν γ' ξαντῆς πραγμάτων ἵστως φρονεῖ (11 ff.).* The slave Othesimus greets Smicrines' arrival with the words³ *τίς ἔσθ' ο κόπτων τὴν θύραν; ὁ, Σμικρίνης | ο χαλεπός, ἐπὶ τὴν προΐκα καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα | ήκων.* Indeed, Smicrines become the type of such sentiments:⁴ a scholiast on *Odysssey* VII. 225 remarks *κομιδῇ γὰρ σμικρολόγος φαίνεται (Οδυσσεὺς) προτάσσων τῶν φιλτάτων τὴν κτῆσιν ὡς παρὰ Μενάνδρῳ Σμικρίνης ἐν Ἐπιτρέποντιν.*

² Sudh.² 631 ff. = Koerte 525 ff.

³ Sudh.² 644 ff. = Koerte 538 ff.

⁴ Schol. Ambros. *ad loc.* (MSS. *σμικρύνησιν ἐπιτρέποντιν*, corr. Meineke).

It is true that no reference to a re-marriage occurs in the extant remains of the play: but that would be taken for granted. Smicrines¹ would not keep his daughter at home. We may compare the opening scene of the *Stichus* (probably Menandrian), the resemblance of which to the *ρήσις* was noticed by Weil. The first hundred and fifty lines of that play are mainly concerned with Antiphon's intention of forcing his two daughters to leave their husbands. We have the lamentations of the daughters, and their arguments with their father: yet only one line of the father's (l. 138), and a few lines of reply, allude (but then as a matter of course) to his further intention of remarrying them. It is noteworthy that the *Stichus* and *Epitrepones* are the only extant comedies (as Legrand remarks) in which daughters of good family appear in conflict with paternal authority.

It remains to point out how well

¹ So in Demosth. *Or. XLI*, 4, when Polyeuctus quarrelled with his son-in-law Leocrates, ἀφελόμενος . . . τὴν θυγατέρα δίδωσι Σπουδίᾳ.

Charisius' remarks, in the scene already mentioned, fit the *ρήσις*. First, as he is quoted, before his entry, by his slave Onesimus: 'ῳ γλυκυτάτη' δὲ 'τῶν λόγων οῖσις λέγεις' (504 Sudh.), which recalls the opening of the *ρήσις*; then in his own speech (addressing himself): οὐοιά γ' εἶπεν οἰς σὺ διενόν τότε πρὸς] τὸν πατέρα· κοινωνὸς ἥκειν τοῦ βίου | παρ' ἄνδρα καὶ δεῖν τάτυχημ' αὐτὴν φυγεῖν | τὸ συμβέβηκός (537 ff. Sudh.), which reads like a summary of ll. 14-26 of the *ρήσις*.² Again, the last words of his speech—an imaginary address to Smicrines—recall the σὺ μὲν βίᾳ | πράξεις ἡ βούλει of its close: τί οὖν ταράττεις καὶ βιάζῃ Παρφίλην;

It cannot, of course, be maintained that these arguments are conclusive; but I hope to have shown that the *ρήσις* fits the scene astonishingly well. Oxyrhynchus has already refuted one attempt to fill the gaps of the *Epitrepones*. It may yet refute (or confirm) this.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

² Ll. 24-26 of the *ρήσις* are quoted by Capps to illustrate this passage of the *Epitrepones*.

HERODAS II 65-71.

δέιρο, Μυρτάλη, καὶ σύ·
δεῖχον σαυτὴν πᾶσι· μηδὲν αἰσχύνειν· 65
νῦμισθε τούτους οἴς ὅρjis δικάζοντας
πατέρας ἀδελφούς ἐμβλέπειν. ὅρjis, Ἀνδρες,
τὰ τιλματά αὐτῆς καὶ κάπωθε κάκωθεν
τὰ λεῖα ταῦτ' ἔτιλλεν ὥντας οὗτος, 70
οὐδὲν εἴλκεν αὐτὴν κάκιστην.

'Come here, Myrtale—it's your turn. Show yourself to all; don't be ashamed. Consider that those whom you see trying the case are your fathers and brethren. Look, gentlemen, up and down, at her rents, how threadbare these were rent by this villain, when he mauled and toused her.'

THIS is the translation of Mr A. D. Knox in his recently published completion of Walter Headlam's work; and it is at any rate faithful enough to Headlam's commentary, which represents that the outrage here alleged against Thales by Battarus is damage to Myrtale's clothing. I cannot find that any editor has ever made this mistake before. It is one which argues some innocence of mind and not much attention to the context or to the meaning of Greek words.

Headlam is of course unable to cite any passage where *τιλλεῖν* or its cognates signify the rending or mauling of garments, and he is obliged to invent an instance: 'the *τιλμοί* with which the Herald threatens the Danaids in Aesch. *Suppl.* 852 include the *πολυμίτων πέπλων ἐπιτιλαβάς* they apprehend in v. 439.' On the contrary, the *τιλμοί* (which he himself rightly translated 'plucking of hair') distinctly exclude the *πέπλων ἐπιτιλαβάς* (which he translated 'rude clutchings of robes'): *τιλμοί πέπλων* would mean shredding robes for lint. When he comes to *λεῖα* he says that it means 'plain' as distinguished from *ἱφαντά* 'embroidered' (Thuc. II 97 3), and that Myrtale's garments, originally *ἱφαντά*, had been made *λεῖα* by the rough handling of her assailant. Rough handling will not unpick embroidery.

And what, by this interpretation, is the ordeal which Myrtale's modesty is summoned to face? Tattered and torn as she may be, she is already present

in court, where anyone could stare at her as he liked: simply to stand forth in her rags is nothing that calls for the encouragement *μηδὲν αἰσχύνει* or for assurances that the jury have minds as chaste as a father's or a brother's. Such language means that she is required to show ἡ κρύπτειν δύματ' ἀρσένων χρεών; and this is necessary in order that the jury may see for themselves

τὰ τίλματ' αὐτῆς, καὶ κάτωθε κάνωθεν
ὡς λεῖα ταῦτ' ἐτίλλεν ὥναγῆς οὔτος,

uolsuras eius, quam glabra haec (quae iam nudata digito demonstrat) et infra et supra euolysis pilis reddiderit.

The mere sense of the words is rightly understood by Buecheler, whose punctuation I have given, and by others if not by all; but I find no sign that anyone sees the joke, which for Herodas and his first readers was the best joke in the mime. When Crusius *Unters.* p. 42 says 'der Schlaukopf spekuliert wohl nicht nur auf das Mitleid, sondern auch auf die Sinnlichkeit der Herrn Geschworenen,' and Hense *Rhein. Mus.* 1900 p. 230 repeats that explanation, they are far astray.

Had Myrtale been induced to surmount her bashfulness under the eyes of a British jury, they might have believed, at least for the moment, that they had ocular evidence of shocking maltreatment; and their horror at the ruffian's brutality would have been equalled or surpassed by their amazement at his thoroughness. The *λειότης* revealed was complete. But that was no surprise or mystery to burghers of Cos. It was none of Thales' handiwork, but an ordinary feature of the feminine toilet, *munditiae mulieres*, perpetuated in marble and still imposed as a convention on sculptors and painters of the nude by the prestige of antiquity. Any woman of Myrtale's trade who was careful of her person and solicitous to please her customers would be *παρατειλμένη*. Battarus achieves the height of his impudence when he offers in proof of outrage a piece of evidence which really shows that the particular outrage alleged was an impossible and a proverbially impossible feat: *φαλακρὸν τίλλειν, nudo detrahere uestimenta*, taking the breeks off a Highlander.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

PICUS-WHO-IS-ALSO-ZEUS.

THE well-known passage in Suidas s.v. Πήκος ὁ καὶ Ζεὺς has given rise to a good deal of bold speculation. It has inspired Miss Harrison to bring Picus to Crete,¹ and, relying upon her, Mr. Bailey now brings him back from Crete to Italy.

The conception of an animal deity is foreign to the strictly animistic notions of the old Roman religion, and we may naturally look to an alien origin. In the case of the woodpecker this is not hard to find: there is good evidence of the cult of the woodpecker (*θρυκολάπτης*) in Crete, where he ultimately became associated with the worship of Zeus.²

The statement that 'there is good evidence' is definitely a slip. Strictly speaking, there is no direct evidence at all that the woodpecker was worshipped in Crete at any period of history. The foundation of the hypothesis that the Greeks once worshipped woodpeckers

consists of a line of Aristophanes³ and the occurrence of the name Keleos in Greek mythology (*a*) as the father of Triptolemus,⁴ and (*b*) the only story specifically connected with Crete, as one of the bronze-clad ruffians who entered the cave of Zeus to steal honey, and in punishment were turned into birds.⁵ The line of Aristophanes no doubt refers to a piece of popular lore, but to found such a theory upon it is surely to attempt to break a butterfly on the wheel, and the interpretation of proper names is an exceedingly flimsy, if popular, foundation for hypotheses. Are we, for instance, to deduce from the *dramatis personae* of Varro's treatise on farming that the Romans formerly worshipped domestic animals? Indeed, when shorn of Miss Harrison's per-

¹ J. E. Harrison, *Themis*, pp. 100 ff.

² C. Bailey, *P. Ovidi Nasonis Fastorum Liber III.* p. 46.

³ Aristophanes, *Birds*, 480 οὐκ ἀποδέσαι ταχέως
ὁ Ζεὺς τὸ σκήπτρον τῷ θρυκολάπτῃ;

⁴ See Roscher s.v. Keleos.

⁵ Antoninus Liberalis XIX.

susive eloquence, there is little to commend the theory that the worship of the woodpecker was indigenous in Crete.

Further, were it true that a woodpecker god had been worshipped in Crete in the Bronze Age, the Cretan origin of Italian Picus would need strong corroborative evidence. The assumption of homogeneity of culture in Italy and the Aegean area during the Bronze Age is often made, but it is hardly warranted. The archaeological evidence is pretty definitely against it.

'On the whole it may be said that the evidence for Mycenaean influence in Italy is rather slender. It is beyond doubt that the south-eastern corner of the peninsula carried on a considerable trade with the Mycenaean Aegean, and if the Torcello vases can be trusted, this trade must have been continued up to the north shores of the Adriatic. Beyond this, and the fact that Sicily fell strongly under Mycenaean influence, little can be said.'¹ Few who have surveyed the evidence collected by Professor Peet are likely to question his verdict.

The sacred bird of Mars from which the Picentines took their name belongs indisputably to an early stratum of Italian religion. At the same time it should be noted that Picus is prominent in mythology and folklore rather than in cult. There is, it is true, the oracle of Mars at Tiora Matiene mentioned at second-hand by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, at which a woodpecker perched upon a wooden post is said to have performed functions analogous to those of the doves at Dodona.² There is no evidence, however, that either the woodpecker or the doves were ever themselves the objects of cults. It is, in fact, extremely difficult to find examples of bird divinities in any part of the world,³ and the comparative evidence is quite conclusive that the attribution of magical or prophetic powers to a bird

or the adoption of a bird name or crest by no means necessarily implies bird worship.

With Miss Harrison and Mr. Bailey I should be disposed to agree that the woodpecker was probably regarded by the Italian peoples as the bird which foretold and even summoned the rain. Throughout Europe it enjoys this reputation in popular belief, partly on account of its cry, partly on account of its noticeable activity when the imminence of rain brings out the insects upon which it feeds.⁴ It was probably these peculiarities, rather than its martial appearance,⁵ which made it the bird of Mars.⁶

In Roman cult Picus figures not at all; he springs into prominence in the Augustan Age as the augur king or the rustic deity, and the reason for this prominence would seem to be the poverty of native mythology. Both this poverty and the amazing literary skill of Virgil are well illustrated in the Seventh Book of the *Aeneid*. This is not the place to attempt to analyse how a romantic atmosphere is created out of the most exiguous material by a dexterous ringing of the changes upon the few names available. Even such bloodless abstractions as Italus and Sabinus are made to contribute to the effect. But in fact the impression of age-long antiquity is so skilfully conveyed that the reader is liable to forget that there are but four generations descending from father to son—Saturnus, Picus, Faunus, Latinus.⁷

Euhemerism had taken firm root at Rome in the days of Ennius, and Virgil's list was no doubt popularly accepted before he set upon it the seal of his authority. Now the identification of Saturnus with the Greek Cronos was admitted. If Saturnus is another name for Cronos, it follows that Picus is another name for Zeus.

That is not, however, the whole story.

¹ Peet, *The Stone and Bronze Ages in Italy*, pp. 514-515.

² Dion. Hal. I. xiv. 5. This statement would be more helpful if we knew with any certainty what the doves at Dodona were and what they did, but we do not.

³ Borneo supplies examples of definite bird cults, but the actual worship of bird divinities is difficult to parallel elsewhere.

⁴ See Swainson, *Folklore of British Birds*, p. 162; Hopf, *Thierarikel und Orakelthiere*, p. 162.

⁵ Plutarch, *Quæst. Rom.* 21.

⁶ So far as it goes the connexion of Picus and the obscure Picumnus with Stercutius (e.g. Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, xviii. 15) seems to support this view.

⁷ Virgil, *Aeneid*, VII. 45 ff.

Picus, who is also Zeus, is first mentioned in a fragment of Diodorus;¹ he is almost always² introduced under this rather cumbrous double-barrelled name; his appearance is uniformly in literature of a particular kind and in a particular context. He is the puppet of the chronographer, not an object of cult nor a factor in religious development. And in passing, an obvious but not unimportant point may be noticed. Πίκος does not mean 'woodpecker' in Greek. It is the legendary king of Italy rather than the magical wood-pecker who occupies the tomb of Zeus in Crete.

At the beginning of the second century B.C., a scheme of world history was proposed, possibly by Zeno of Rhodes, the main idea of which was a succession of four world empires—the Assyrian, the Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman. A subsidiary but favourite feature of the scheme was the synchronising of the fall of the Assyrian empire with the foundation of Rome.³ This point appealed with especial force to Christian writers, for

¹ Diodorus, VI, 5.

² An exception is Pausanias of Damascus, Frag. 4. (*Hist. Graec. Min.* I. ed. Dindorf, p. 179) who tells us that Seleucus sacrificed ἐν τῷ λεπρῷ τῷ κτισθέντι ὑπὸ Ηέροντος τοῦ νεώτεροῦ Πίκου καὶ Δανάου τῷ δυντὶ εἰς τὸ Σιληνιόν ὅρον. Here the identification with Zeus is, of course, implied, and it is used to form a link between Oriental and European history (see Note 5 below).

³ Triebner, 'Die Idee der vier Weltreiche,' *Hermes*, XXVII. (1892), pp. 321-344. This idea was taken over by the medieval historians. Cf. at the end of the thirteenth century Higden, *Polychronicon* (Rolls Series, London, 1865), II., p. 256; at the end of the twelfth century the second recension of the *De Mirabilibus Urbis Romae* (Nichols, *The Marvels of Rome*, London, 1889, pp. 2 and 3) contains muddled reminiscences of the system.

whom Rome was the second Babylon of apocalyptic writing. Euhemerism enabled the scheme to be worked out in a single whole by means of identifications justified by the existing practice of polytheism as regards the identification of foreign with native gods. Thus Picus-who-is-also-Zeus is also Ninus, or the brother of Ninus. It is only, as far as I am aware, in passages connected with the alleged interrelation of the histories of Assyria and Rome that Πίκος ὁ καὶ Ζεύς figures.⁴

The association, therefore, is that of Picus, not of a woodpecker, with Zeus, and it takes place not in Crete, but in the study of the historians. This surely disposes of the value of Suidas as a witness for woodpecker-worship. If it be asked, why then should Crete come into the story, an answer is not difficult to find. The tomb of Zeus in Crete is the foundation-stone of Euhemerist doctrine, and observation suggests that it is difficult to mention Euhemerism without bringing it in. Both Servius and Mr. Bailey provide examples, the former *ad Aen.* VII. 150, the latter on p. 20 of his masterly introduction to the Third Book of the *Fasti*, with a minor detail of which I have ventured to disagree.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

⁴ Diodorus VI, 5; Ioannes Antiochenus, Frags. 4, 6 (F.H.G. IV. pp. 542-544); Malalas I, 19, II, 28, 34 (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* XCIVII. pp. 85, 95, 104); *Chronicon Paschale*, 36-38, 44 (Migne, *Pat. Graec.* XCII. pp. 143 ff.); *Excerpta Barbari* in Frick, *Chronica Minor*, 243, 25. Picus-Zeus is identified with Ninus, or the brother of Ninus, and is the father of Perseus, the ancestor of the Persians. Faunus, his son=Hermes Trismegistus, and forms the link with Egyptian history. Io also plays a part in this systematisation of history. Antioch was founded on the site of Iopolis, to which she fled to escape Faunus—Hermes Trismegistus.

[ARISTOTLE] OECONOMICA.

IT may be hoped that Mr. Forster's useful translation of the pseudo-Aristotelian *Oeconomica*, noticed in the *Classical Review*, Vol. XXXV, p. 70, will draw attention to that interesting compilation. The Second Book, with its collection of devices adopted by princes and potentates for raising

revenue, seems to have been suggested by *Politics*, 1259a 3 ff., 33 ff., when Aristotle wrote: 'It would be well also to collect the scattered stories of the ways in which individuals have succeeded in amassing a fortune; for all this is useful to persons who value the art of getting wealth. . . . And states-

men as well ought to know these things; for a state is often as much in want of money and of such devices for obtaining it as a household, or even more so.'

The following notes may supplement those of the reviewer:

1343b 10 ff.: πολλὰ τοιάτια ἡ φύσις ἐφέρει ἀπεργάσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν ζῴων ἔκαστον. '(Our) nature, like (that of) the various (other) animals, desires to multiply, and to reproduce the species': *τοιάτια* means 'like the parent,' as in *Pol.* 1252a 30, of which this passage is a reminiscence.

1344a 30: ἀνέτα, either trans., or intrans., depending on *ἔαν*: in either case the meaning is 'allow them to get slack' and incapable of work; cf. *infr.* θύμοις ἐμποιεῖ . . . ἀδυνατίας ποιεῖ.

1345a 10: For *ώς* read *ὥτε*. 'That a good copy is impossible without a good example is true of the delegation of authority as in other matters; so that unless the master is careful, it is impossible that the overseers he appoints should be careful.'

1347b 12: ἡγόραζον οἱ στρατιώται παρὰ τούτων ἀπαντά, 'the troops had to buy all their provisions from these quartermasters'—i.e. were compelled to buy, either by order or by circumstances. The men did not buy out the canteen straight away, but kept on buying there

throughout the campaign, each two months' sales bringing in enough cash for the next two months' pay.

1349a 1: ἔξαγογήν ἔδωκαν τῷ βουλομένῳ, 'they allowed anyone who wished to export corn'—viz. from the surplus compulsorily bought up by the State after each individual had retained enough to live on till next harvest. The State sold this to exporters at a price fixed to recoup the cost of the compulsory purchase and yield a revenue in addition. The exporters no doubt made what price they could in the famine districts to which they carried the corn.

1349a 4: τῶν μετοίκων ὃν προεμένω, 'refused them advances,' cf. *Eth.* 1164a 23, 35, b26. The reference is to metoeces not as payers of an alien tax, but as bankers and capitalists.

1353b 22 ff.: οὐτα δὲ τῶν ἀγαλμάτων φιλῆται εἰχε προτετακτά, ετερά τη δέχομαι ἔξαρεῖν ἐκλενεῖν. The object of *ἔξαρεῖν* is the cups rather than the statues, the cups being presumably of gold or silver like the tables *supra*, and the clothing and wreaths on the statues *infra*; *ἔξαρεῖν* 'to take out of the hand of the statue, in contrast with *ἀφαρεῖν*, 'to carry off' the tables. The attitude of the statues suggested *propinatio*, and on festal occasions it was often a custom to make a present of the cup to the person pledged, L. and S. s.v. *προτίνω*.

H. RACKHAM.

PLATO, REPUBLIC, 421A, AGAIN.

εἰ . . . ἡμεῖς μὲν φύλακας ὡς ἀληθῶς πιοῦμεν . . . δὸς ἔκεινον λέγων γεωργούς τινας καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν παντηρῷ δὲλλ' οὐκ ἐν πόλει ἑστιάτορας εὑδαλμοντας . . .

MR. A. S. FERGUSON writes again in defence of his conjecture *χορηγούς* for *γεωργούς*, as against Mr. R. G. Bury's *γεωμάρούς*.¹ He admits that a reference to the Syracusan *γεωμάροις* would not be inappropriate, if there were evidence that they were, like the Mikados of old Japan, 'seeming and not real rulers,' notorious for *fainéance* and display. But he finds no such evidence. As against the view that *ἐν παντηρῷ* here refers to 'a promiscuous gathering,' he argues² that the figure of the over-brilliant eye, the analogy of farmers peacocking in the attire of the stage, and the general contrast of 'men who simulate with men who are,' lead up logically to a contrast between 'real guardians and distinguished nullities whose leanings towards pomp and state may find a harmless outlet in the *παντηρούς*'. He adduces, in support of his view, *Rep.* 577a (δὸς . . . μὴ . . . ἐκπλήρεται υπὸ τῆς τῶν τυραννικῶν προστάσεως ην πρὸς τὸν ἔξο σχηματοτατον)³ and 577b (*γυμνὸς . . . τῆς τραγικῆς σκευῆς*),⁴ and adds:

'Like ourselves, the Greeks used purely ornamental functions to illustrate the side of the ruler's life that appeals to the *φιλοθεάμων*. Socrates simply draws for the first time in political

theory a firm line between what Aristotle called the *φύσις* or *ἀρετή* of a ruler and his *χορηγία*,⁵ and his examples show that the objector demands, not a real *βλοτό*, but an *ἡδεῖα διαγωγή*, an *ἀνάπαντας*, not a *πρᾶξις*. His warning in 421a might be put in Plutarch's words: ὅτα μὴ πομητὴν ἐπανοῦντι καὶ παντηρούντι μᾶλλον η βίον ἔνος (De Cupid. Divit. 527d).

'Of many examples from political literature which might be chosen to illustrate the tenor of Book IV. c. 1 I select one—Plutarch, *Præcepta Gerendae Republicæ*, c. 31. The whole chapter is worth comparing carefully (especially 822f); I quote the last example (823d): οἱ δὲ πολλοί, καὶ ἐν ἀρχῇ τὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ φρόνιμον ἀπορρίψων, ὑστερον καταμανθόνοντες τὴν ἀλήθευτον καὶ τὸ ἥθος τούτους ἡγούντας μένον πολιτικὸν καὶ δημοτικόν καὶ δρόσου, τῶν δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν μὲν χορηγὸν τὸν δὲ ἑστιάτορα τὸν δὲ γυμναστροχόν καὶ νομίζοντας καὶ καλοῦσιν. εἴδος ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις, Καλλίον δαπανῶντος ἢ Ἀλκιβιάδου, Σωκράτης ἀκοντεῖται καὶ πρὸς Σωκράτην τὸντες ἀποβλέπονταν, οὐτως ἐν ταῖς ὑγιαινούσαις πόλεσιν Ιστρηλας μὲν ἐπιδέσποια καὶ δειπνοῦσει Λήγας⁶ καὶ χορηγεῖς Νικηφόρος, Επαγεινάνδας δὲ καὶ Ἄριστελῆς καὶ Αἰσανδρος καὶ δρόσουν καὶ πολιτεύονται καὶ στρατηγούσιν. The previous example, with exactly the same kind of illustration, was drawn from Phylarchos; comparison with *De Cupid. Divit.* 527b suggests that Theophrastos may be the source of this as of other passages in the tract.'

¹ See *Class. Quart.* XVIII. p. 163; *Class. Rev.* XXXIV. p. 32; XXXV. pp. 17, 81.

² Citing *604e* 'for an official Athenian *παντηρούς*'

³ Cf. Isocr. *Nikokles*, 32.
⁴ Cf. Dion. Or. IV. 61.

NO. CCLXXXVI. VOL. XXXVI.

⁵ *χορηγία* soon ceased to be felt as a metaphor. For Aristotle's usage see Bywater, *Poetics*, 1453b 8. For Socrates's ironical proof that the *χορηγός* is the best guardian, see Xen., *Mem.* III., iv. 6.

⁶ Xen., *Mem.* I., ii. 61.

EXCLAMATORY QUESTIONS WITH
UT IN LATIN.

1. 'Victamne ut quisquam victri patriae praeferret?' (Livy V. 24. 10).

2. 'Di magni, ut qui civem Romanum occidisset, impunitatem acciperet?' (Sen. *De Beneficiis* V. 16. 3.)

3. 'Egone ut te interpellem?' (Cic. *Tusc.* II. 18. 42.)

4. 'Tu ut unquam te corrigas?' (Cic. *Cat.* I. 9. 22.)

Note in 1 and 2 imperfect subjunctive, in 3 and 4 present subjunctive. Does the difference in tense denote any real difference in sense? Does the imperfect lay a slightly greater stress than the present on the absurdity of the deprecated result? Note also in 1 and 3 the presence of *ne*, in 2 and 4 its absence: this difference is negligible, though one might ask why not *num* in both cases (1 and 3). Note, thirdly, that in 1 and 4 *quisquam* and *unquam* show plainly that the negative answer is expected, and the result deprecated.

Gildersleeve and Lodge (*Lat. Gram.* § 558) assert categorically that there is here 'no definite or conscious ellipsis.' I find it difficult to accept this view. Is there not a definite, though in use sub-conscious, ellipse of *aequum est, verisimile est* (*verisimile est ut*, as in Cic. *Rosc. Am.* 51)? Consider the sentences so completed: thus,

1. Aequumne est ut victam quisquam . . .?

2. Di magni, aequum est ut qui . . . occidisset,

3. Estne verisimile ut ego te interpellem?

4. Est verisimile ut tu unquam te corrigas?

I submit that the omission of the short main clause (*aequumne est*, etc.) is palliated by the strong emphasis thrown on to the first word. This is quite clear in 1. 3. 4. *Victam, Ego, Tu.* It applies also, though not quite so obviously, to 2, where the subject, *qui . . . occidisset*, consisting of a clause, is certainly in better position after the *ut* than before it.

I venture to ask grammarians for information and their views.

S. E. WINBOLT.

'COR HABERE' IN THE 'THESAURUS.'

—The examples of this phrase given by the *Thes.* are neither easy to discover in the long article *cor*, nor are they anything like complete. Lewis-Short ignores the phrase; Forcellini-De Vit usefully supplies some three or four examples s.v. *cor* (No. 7). These, with those given by the *Thes.*, provide a modest list ranging from Plautus to Ausonius. It is a pity no examples are given from Augustine, for he makes greater use of the phrase than all the others put together, though I have found nothing to indicate its survival elsewhere among Christian writers of his

time. A few examples of his use of it may be given:

Ep. 85. 2 noui quia cor habes, sed et tardum securum est quando in coelo est, et acutum cor nihil est quando in terra est; *Ep.* 141. 3 uos responderetis, si cor haberetis; *Ep.* 220. 5 init. Christianus es, cor habes; *Util. Ieiun.* 7. 9 habent cor, sciunt lapidem sentire non posse; *In Ps.* 75. 16 cor habeant; non sint fatui. (Cf. *In Ps.* 34. *Serm.* 2. 8 ubicumque inuenient Christianum, solent . . . uocare hebetem, insulsum, nullius cordis; *In Ps.* 36, *Serm.* 3, 8 parui cordis aut non sani cordis). (To these another sheaf may be added from the index to Augustine's anti-Donatist works, in Vienna Corpus, Vol. LIII.)

The phrase *redire ad cor* (from Isaia 46. 8) is also noteworthy; it is naturally frequent among Christian authors.

It may be of interest to mention that Vol. VI., fasc. 6 of the *Thes.* (from *FRV* on) is now in the press and may be looked for soon, though financial difficulties threaten further progress. I take the following from a letter from the *Thes.* offices, dated February 23:

(Scholars are informed) 'nos praesto esse ex schedis Thesauri uocabula in usum doctorum exscribere, si id, quod in ea re conficienda temporis consumetur, modica mercede compensabitur. Ut enim mendicari nos piget, ita grati erimus, si nobis potestas facta erit, honesto labore pauxillum aeris mereri ad sustentandas animi et corporis uires Thesauro conficiendo dedicatas.'

It is to be hoped that scholars will take advantage of this offer; it would be a pity to see this vast undertaking, which, with all its faults, is indispensable, brought to a standstill ('summum esse periculum,' my correspondent says, 'ne opus imperfectum relinquatur'); it is common knowledge that foreign scholars are in the utmost distress.

AUGUSTINE AND VIRGIL, *Ecl.* I. 70.—The value of *testimonia* found in the neglected Christian writers has been often pointed out in the *C.R.* I am not aware that the following has been brought to notice: in his *Quaestiones in Genesim*, XCIV., commenting on Gen. 31. 41 'decepisti mercedem meam decem agnibus' (A. V. 'Thou hast changed my wages ten times'), Augustine says:

'nec mirum quod haec decem tempora nomine agnorum appellauit, qui eisdem temporibus nascebantur; uelut si quisquam dicat "per tot uindemias" aut "tot messes," quibus

numeris intellegatur annorum. unde ait quidam "post aliquot aristas," per "aristas" uidelicet "messes," et per "messes," "annos" significans?

J. H. BAXTER.

THE EXPRESSION 'FONS ET ORIGO.'

THE great *Thesaurus*, indispensable as it is, occasionally disappoints the student. Under the word *fons* we fully expected to find an account of the expression *fons et origo*, which looks like the major portion of the second half of a pentameter, say *fons et origo mali*. But of this phrase the *Thesaurus* furnishes not a word; it does not even give *origo* as a kind of synonym of *fons*. We have, therefore, thought it well to communicate all the examples in our own lexical collections, in the hope that other readers may amplify them, and, if possible, tell us the origin of the expression.

Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* I. II. 52 (ed. Vienna, Vol. I., p. 46, l. 5); *ib.* 2. 13. 13 (p. 162, 15).

Victorinus, *In Eph.* I. 20 (Migne P.L. VIII. 1250 D).

Ambrose, *Expos. Ps. cxviii.*, 16. 6. 3; 16. 7. 2.

Pacianus, *Eph.* I. I (p. 1 P.).

Ambrosiaster, *Quæst. Vetus. et Nov. Test.* 123 (p. 376, 3 ed. Vien.)

Evagrius, *Vit. S. Antonii*, 20.

Augustine, *In Ps.* 58 *Serm.* I, 18.

Pelagius, *Eph. ad Dem.* 26 'fons boni et origo peccandi.'

Salvian, *Gub. Dei* 4. 9. 44.

A. SOUTER,
J. H. BAXTER.

NOTES ON LUCRETIUS.

IV. 961.

fit ratione eadem coniectus partim animai altior atque foras electus largior eius, et diuisior inter se ac distractior intus.

The last line evidently lacks a verb. Rather than resort to '*intus*'—an usage for which we have no warrant in Lucretius, with the doubtful exception of '*necessust*' (*cf.* also Ellis on Catull. XXIII. 27)—I would suggest the anaphora '*fit diuisior*' . . . , which at once supplies the verb and dispenses with the need for the copula. Failure to seize the latter point, or to see that '*diuisior*' and '*distractor*' are not co-ordinate with the comparatives in the preceding line, might lead to the corruption. We should then understand '*anima*' from 959 as subject of '*fit*', as *e.g.* '*aeris*' is understood in 934 above from '*aeris*' of 933.

IV. 1058:

haec Venus est nobis: hinc autem nomen amoris.

I fail to see the relevance of making Lucretius here etymologise on the name '*Cupido*': rather he seems to wish to say that '*mula cupido*' and its attendant '*simulacra*' are the harbingers of love ('*praesagit*', 1057). '*Nomen*', I think, seems clearly to have come from 1062, and may have ousted '*omen*'. In the case of the loved one's absence, the presence of '*simulacra*'

are an omen of love, as explained in the following lines.

IV. 1189:

*tu animo tamen omnia possis
protrahere in lucem atque omnis inquirere
risus . . .*

I cannot think that '*risus*' is in point here. There is nothing in the context to explain who is laughing, at whom, or why: the '*uitiae poscaenia*' (1186), which the woman is trying to hide, and the methods by which she endeavours to hide them, are surely no *laughing* matter for her, nor can the laughter be that of the imaginary reader whom Lucretius is admonishing. I would suggest therefore '*omnis inquirere ritus*', *cf.* V. 923 and Liv. 24. 3. 12, '*in alienos ritus mores legesque uerti*'. Here, perhaps, the word may have something of the sense of 'mysteries'.—'*Risus*' was probably suggested by 1140 and 1176 *supr.*

V. 182.

*notities hominum diuis unde est insita
primum.*

The simplest cure would seem to be '*notities hominum diuis unde insita primum*': the elusive enclitic '*st*' is apt to be lost altogether at the end of a line, as *e.g.* in I. III, V. 302, VI. 746. '*Est*' would then be missed, and added without regard to metre.

V. 1106:

commutare nouis monstrabant rebus et igni.
But fire was not additional to the '*nouae res*'; it was one of them. '*Igni*' itself, however, may well be sound: it is fitting that Lucretius should lay stress on the invention of fire as the most momentous of early discoveries. Hence we may suggest '*nouis . . . rebus, ut igni*': this would furnish a link between the digression on the origin of fire and the general description of human progress. Confusion of '*et*' and '*ut*' occurs, *e.g.* in I. 155, I. 772, I. 806.

VI. 48.

*uentorum exirstant placentur et omnia rursum
quaue fuerint sint placato conuersa fauore.*

Lambinus' '*furore*' appears certain, and Bernays' '*existant*' and Mr. Bailey's '*furerent*' at all events highly probable.

In order, however, the better to account for '*exirstant*', and to avoid the somewhat staccato effect of '*existant, placentur, et omnia*', etc., it may be suggested that 48 is a conflation of two lines, the first beginning '*uentorum existant*' . . . <*proelia*, or the like>, the second running '*ex ira tanta placentur, et omnia*', etc., the sense being 'I will tell how battles of the winds break out, and then again how after so great wrath they are lulled to rest.' The copyist's eye would stray from EXISTANT to EXIRANT.

R. J. SHACKLE.

CATALEPTON VII.

SCILICET hoc sine fraude, Vari dulcissime,
dicam:
dispeream, nisi me perdidit iste Pothus.
sin autem praeepta uetant me dicere, sane
non dicam, sed me perdidit iste puer.

In printing these much-vexed verses, the only alteration which I have made in the Oxford text is in reading *Pothus* for *putus* at the end of the second line. This respects the M.S. tradition, makes sense, and removes the difficulties which have led to such attempts at remedy as that of G. Jachmann in *Hermes* LVII. (1922), 317-319.

The text critics appear not to have realised that both *Πόθος* and *Pothus* are well-attested proper names, chiefly of slaves and freedmen, in the early imperial period and even somewhat earlier: see Pape-Benseler, *Wörterbuch der gr. Eigennamen*, s.v. *Πόθος*, and the *indices cognominum* to Dessau, *Inscr. Lat. Sel.*, and to the several volumes of the *Corpus Inscr. Lat.* The *Pothus* of *C.I.L.* VI. 1374 was a contemporary of Virgil. It was perhaps fanciful to observe that the *Pothus* of the Pompeian inscription, *C.I.L.* X. 824, which is dated in the year 3 A.D., might have been of a proper age in Virgil's youth to inspire the poem; very probably the writer is merely using the romantic-sounding name in lieu of a more ordinary one. The *praecepta* of which he stands in awe are presumably the philosophical maxims that warn against excess of passion.

A. W. VANBUREN.

SOME DIFFICULTIES IN OVID, FASTY III.

(a) 283-4:

atque aliquis, modo trux, uisa iam uertitur ara
uinaque dat tepidis farraque salsa foci.

Mr. Bailey notes: '*uertitur*, "is changed," almost "converted."'. No doubt the word can have this meaning; but as the next line mentions the offering made by the repentant *trux*, is it not likelier that it means 'turns' in the literal sense? For the ritual turn in prayer, see among other passages *Livy* V. 21, 16; *Lucr.* V. 1198 ff.

(b) 715-16:

nec referam Semelen, ad quam nisi fulmina
secum
Iuppiter adferret, partus inermis eras.

I do not enter into the grammatical difficulties of this passage; through the mist of doubtful readings and interpretations this seems to emerge clearly, that if Iuppiter had not appeared to Semele with his lightnings, her child Bakchos would have been *inermis*—i.e., presumably, an ordinary babe, without the horns which, as bull or serpent, he regularly wore; a roundabout way of saying that he would not have been divine. For the idea that to be struck by lightning confers divinity (instead of merely making the victim *sacer*) see *Diod. Sic.* V. 52, 2.

(c) In his note on 851 ff., Mr. Bailey says: 'No doubt in primitive thought Phrixus was himself the ram.' I would deprecate the assumption (1) that the theriomorphic form of a deity or hero must be the older, (2) that close association with a beast proves former identity with it. For (1) though theriomorphism is a very old belief, perhaps resulting from the same frame of mind which produces totemism (it is

not identical with the latter, as some belated Continental writers seem to imagine), nevertheless for any given area it is not necessarily prior to anthropomorphism, and for Greece in particular we have Achaian and pre-Achaian evidence for anthropomorphic deities, while Kekrops and other such monstrosities are so far as we know later, Dionysos and Zeus-Ammon foreign. (2) We should remember such facts as the association of both Mithras and Hermes with the cock, of whom the former shows no trace of a beast form, the latter is much older in Greece than the *Ιερακός ὄρνις*.

What does result from our material is a singularly close association between Phrixos and the fleece of the ram. In Pindar (*Pyth.* IV. 159) he appears in a dream κέλεται έαν ψυχάν κομίσαι . . . δέρρα τε κριόν βαθυμαλλον ἄγειν; but when the Fleece is won no one seems to doubt that the whole errand is accomplished. It would seem to follow that the two are identical—i.e., that Phrixos is of the numerous kin of the Giant with no heart in his body, and the Fleece was his 'external soul.'

H. J. ROSE.

'DECLAMARE'—KATHXEIN.

IT is rather surprising that while most Latin rhetorical terms are either close translations of their Greek equivalents, as 'compositio' for *σύνθετος*, or convey the same general idea, as 'dispositio' for *οἰκονομία*, this is not the case with the term which, if not the most important of all, at any rate denotes the most important of rhetorical institutions. For the Greek equivalent of 'declamatio' is regularly *μελετή*¹—a fact to which Quintilian alludes when he says (IV. 2. 29) 'declamatio est forensium actionum meditatio.' Apart from this consideration, the name seems to me in itself an odd one.

From a literary point of view the declamation may perhaps be compared to the novel. As an educational institution, it may sometimes remind us of the school debating society, sometimes of the school O.T.C. But really its closest analogy, as it seems to me, is our examination system. Both stand out as institutions, success in which is the crown of school life, and both have lived and flourished in the face of much fashionable detraction. Our apostles of gloom and mirth, Dean Inge and Mr. Stephen Leacock, have both recently denounced the examination system. So did their Roman predecessors, Tacitus and Petronius, deal with the declamations. Yet what permanent effect did they have? The institution lived on to the fall of the Empire or beyond, as the keystone of the educational system.

Now 'declamatio' according to the ordinary interpretation, means 'loud shouting,' and no doubt carries with it such suggestions as exaggeration and emotionalism, much as 'spouting' or 'ranting' would with us. It is, in fact, a hostile or derisive term, and at first sight the undoubtedly hostility felt in many quarters may seem to explain it sufficiently, though it may be noted that it is rather unreality that is charged

¹ *ἀγών* which is sometimes given is rather 'controversia,' a subdivision of 'declamatio.'

against the practice, than the defects, which the term 'declamatio' suggests.¹ But does such a hostile origin provide a satisfactory explanation of an educational term, universally accepted by the admirers and promoters of the institution? It is as if 'cramming' and 'crammers' should come to be accepted examination terms in the official language of scholastic and academic dignitaries; and this, too, though the Greek schools in whose wake the Latin schools were treading so carefully had a term which was perfectly appropriate and dignified. I suggest—it cannot, of course, be more than a suggestion—that the true explanation is that 'declamatio' was originally a translation of *κατήχησις*.² The verbal correspondence is exact, indeed slavishly so, and the only question is whether a reasonable agreement in meaning can be made out. I think it can.

Katηχειν and its derivatives in the sense of 'instruct' or 'orally instruct,' are of course most familiar to us from N.T. and Christian usage, but they are well authenticated as general scholastic terms. Rutherford³ held that the word properly applies to the noise made by the class repeating a lesson in chorus, and that the transitive sense is secondary. I know of no evidence for this, and prefer the ordinary view that the meaning is properly to din into the ears, whence there is an easy transition first to advice or general instruction⁴ and then to scholastic or literary instruction, a sense which is found at any rate as early as Dionysius of Halicarnassus. I suggest that the rendering 'declamare' was popularised in the Latin rhetorical schools when they first came into existence amid stormy surroundings about 92 B.C. Originally the 'declamatio' would mean a course of instruction, of which the μελέτη was a part, but only a part, and would cover (to use the terms employed by Philostratus⁵ in later times) both the μελέτηρά συνονοία and the διδασκαλική συνονοία. But it is quite

probable that from the first the μελέτη held a more prominent place in these Latin schools than it held in the Greek. Indeed, the interesting passages,⁶ in which Cicero describes the opposition to the Latin rhetors and their leader Plotius Gallus, have been understood to imply this.⁷ At any rate, a contrast in this respect existed in Quintilian's time,⁸ and it was only natural that it should be so. Boys might be sent to study under both Greek and Latin rhetors, but the products of the former were more independent of parental and public criticism than those of the latter. The 'sudans pater adductus amicis' might listen with pride to his son's Greek μελέτη, but not with the same interest and comprehension as to his Latin performance. Thus, in the Latin schools, I suggest, the term 'declamatio' rapidly came to mean not so much the course of instruction or *κατήχησις* itself, as what to teacher, pupil, and parent alike was its most absorbing part. If a notice appeared 'Plotius declamat hodie,' he himself might mean that he would give instruction, but the public expected and got a rhetorical exhibition. The development⁹ by which the term is extended from the teacher's μελέτη to the pupil's, and the latter himself is said 'declamare' was an inevitable one. Parallel changes in meaning to these might be multiplied indefinitely.¹⁰

The history of the use of 'declamatio' for this kind of rhetorical performance is quite in accordance with this view—that is to say, the usage appears within a reasonable distance from the establishment of the Latin rhetorical schools. The elder Seneca notes¹¹ that he could not find it in any author earlier than Cicero and Calvus. He gives a quotation from the latter, while for Cicero we have (*Brut.* 310) 'commentabar declamitans' with the significant addition 'sic enim nunc loquuntur.'

F. H. COLSON.

¹ Quintilian hits off the common note of depreciation when (V. 12, 17) he speaks of the declamations as 'praepilatae,' foils with the button on, and says that they 'nervis carent.'

² It might well, of course, become contaminated with the hostile sense at quite an early period.

It has been suggested to me that 'declamatio' may have been a translation of *ἀναφώνησις*. This word seems to be used by Galen and Plutarch for exercises in voice production, but I can find no grounds for thinking that it was ever used for the rhetorical μελέτη.

³ *Hist. of Annotation*, p. 31.

⁴ In *Att. XV.* 12 Cicero, in discussing (B.C. 44) Octavian's probable attitude, puts on the unfavourable side 'quid aetati credendum sit, quid nomini, quid hereditati, quid κατηχήσει?' Tyrrell and Rutherford (l.c.) take the word to mean 'education.' I think it means rather the advice which he hears from those around him, just as Cleanthes (*Diog. Laert.* VII. 89) said διαστρέφεσθαι τὸ λογικὸν ζῶν ποτὲ μὲν διὰ τὰς τὴν ἔξωθεν πραγματεύον πιθανότητας, ποτὲ δὲ διὰ τὴν κατηχήσιν τῶν συνόντων.

⁵ *Vit. Soph.* I. 23.

⁶ *De Or.* III. 93 and *Ap. Suet. Rhet.* 4.

⁷ So Boissier (*Mélanges Perrot*, p. 15). I think the difference between the two types, though probably including a different attitude to the μελέτη, goes deeper. The one discouraged, and the other encouraged, any popular element. Marx (Prol. to *Ad Herenn.* 147 ff.) may be right to some extent in thinking that the question had a political aspect. Plotius was certainly a friend of Marius.

⁸ *Inst. Or.* II. 1. 1, compared with I. 9. 6.

⁹ If Rutherford is right in his idea of the origin of *κατηχεῖν* as a scholastic term (v. note above) there is of course no development. The term applies to pupil as much as to teacher.

¹⁰ Perhaps more especially in the scholastic and academical world—e.g., *classics* itself, *wrangler*, *secondary school*, *composition*, which, I presume, eighty years ago, meant composing (ostensibly) *original* Latin verse and prose. Many such changes of meaning come from abbreviation, and I should not be surprised if there was an intermediate period when the rhetorical performance was called 'declamatio meditativa' = *κατηχήσις μελέτηρά*.

¹¹ *Contr. I.*, *Proem* 12.

REVIEWS

THE LANGUAGE OF HOMER.

Die Homerische Kunstsprache. Von KARL MEISTER. Preisschriften gekrönt und herausgegeben von der fürstlich Jablonowskischen Gesellschaft. Quarto. Pp. 3+262. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1921. M. 180.

THE above work forms a handsome volume that reflects great credit upon the distinguished Society responsible for its publication, as also upon its printers and producers. In Germany, at any rate, classical learning is not altogether on the wane even in these days of widespread stress and difficulty, the aftermath of the war. Professor Karl Meister of Heidelberg University is an accomplished scholar and an enthusiastic exponent of the view he has adopted of the language of the Homeric poems. Undoubtedly a closer study of the text is a matter of the first necessity, and is of far more real value than many high-soaring speculations into origins and folk-lore. Accordingly, I heartily welcome this very interesting statement of the result of a searching analysis of the early epic language. The author calls it an art- or technical-language, and in a certain sense the term is applicable to the work of every great poet that ever existed. But he means, as the reader will soon discover, much more than this. He believes that Homer's language is to a large extent an artificial speech containing novel forms forced upon him to meet the requirements of a difficult metre. I do not by any means rate Homer's capacity so low, but the view is not altogether novel, and is fundamental to this treatise, which accordingly opens with an elaborate examination and analysis of the Homeric hexameter covering Part I. pp. 3-58. The rest of the volume, Part II. p. 61 onwards, contains the investigation and discussion of archaic and modern forms, with two indices (1) of the words and (2) of the subject-matter.

We are all familiar with the statement that the language of Homer is composite and could never have been a spoken dialect, mainly, as I have seen it

stated, because it contains a superabundance of pronouns. Why any sensible poet or poets should have taken the trouble to compose two long epics in largely unintelligible language is a mystery no one is ever likely to solve. Even blindness would not have protected the bard who attempted to play off such a trick upon an assembly of nobles such as met in the hall of Odysseus or, in less disorderly form, in that of Alcinous. He would very soon have been called to order in such terms as another Alcinous used in a less exasperating case:

"Ἐσθε ἔκηλος, ξῖνε, καθίμενος, η ἀπιθ' ὅλῃ,
μή σε νέοι διὰ δῶμα ἐρύσσωτο", οἱ ἀγορεύει,
η πόδος η και χειρός, ἀποδύνωσι δὲ πάρτα.

ἐσθε (Bentley), not, as the tradition reads, ἔσθι', or the protester might himself have fared, at the hands of his compeers, no better than the offending bard. I do not charge Professor Meister with going to such an extreme as does the statement on which I have commented, but he goes no little distance in the same direction when he contends that Homer introduced arbitrary forms to fit the scansion particularly, but by no means exclusively, in the fourth foot—e.g. ἐλώρια for ἐλώρα, διώκετο for δίωκε, ἐνήρατο (ἐναίρω), ἀθεμίστιος for ἀθέμιστος, πανδήμος for πάνδημος, and very many others. Some of these he is not quite sure about; but he has no misgivings regarding πτολιπόρθιος for πτολίπορθος. The elongated form occurs twice only:

ι 504 φάσθαι Ὀδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον ἔξαλαῶσαι
ι 530 δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον οἰκαδ' ἵκεθαι.

On the other hand, πτολίπορθος occurs eighteen times, and always at the end of the line. Who can doubt that the two quoted passages would be more truly read thus?

φάσθαι σ' ἔξαλαῶσαι Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίπορθον
δὸς μὴ οἰκαδ' ἵκεσθαι Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίπορθον.

Herr Meister says, rightly enough, on p. 103 that in Homer words and forms must be held to belong to the living speech until the opposite is proved, and yet the main object of this highly important contribution to our know-

ledge is to brand as poetical inventions, not in the living speech, a vast number of words against which he is practically the first to raise any objection. What possible proof can be adduced that ἀνόστιμος was not in the living speech as well as ἀνοστός, in view of the frequency of νόστιμος? It seems to me that duplicate forms are far more likely to be found in a primitive language than in a literary one, in the early epic than in the refined Attic. Still we must fix reasonable limits: ἐπιδίφρια (ο 51.75) may represent an original ἐπί δίφροο, cf. ξ222 δήμοο φῆμις: the curious forms προσώπατα and προσώπασι are certainly unacceptable. In H 212 I would adopt βλοσυρῆσιν ὑπ' ὄφρύσιν from Ο 608, cf. *Hymn. Dem.* 357-8. I have discussed ο 192 in *Homericia* pp. 318-21.

All scholars admit that the tradition contains many modifications, which the rhapsodists have adopted in order that both public and private recitations might, by a closer approximation to the familiar speech of the day, become more readily intelligible. This gradual infiltration of change was inevitable: it was bound to occur as an accompaniment to the change in the language that was made between the time of Homer and that, let us say, of Euripides. So we find θάρσει, 'Cheer up,' which everybody said, for θάρσει which everybody had ceased to say. All that is in Homer is not Homeric: still less is all that is in Hesiod Hesiodic, for Hesiod never possessed the popularity or excited the enthusiastic admiration and reverence that attended the Homeric poems wherever Hellenic culture had a foothold. The great defect of this volume is that the author has never recognised this, as Wackernagel and others have done. It is mere paradox to say, as he does in his final sentence, that the chief alterations of the language of the *epos* were introduced before and not after Homer. If he has a copy of a pre-Homeric Homer in his pocket or in his head, he ought to produce it, but the result would be even more calamitous, I fear, than Fick's Aeolic attempt which he himself rejects.

To Bentley's discovery of the presence of the digamma, the most brilliant and progressive step ever taken in the criticism of the Homeric poems he

pays little heed. The chapter on Vau is quite perfunctory. Vau, he says, is a dead sound, and then again 'although it was sounded it was never written.' How does he know this? Good scholars, Cobet, Nauck, van Leeuwen, to say nothing of his own countrymen, have thought otherwise.

The audacity with which tradition occasionally maltreats good hexameter lines may be seen in the one (p. 42) quoted as Homer's on the authority of Athenaeus:

καλὴ Κασσιέπεια θεοῦ δέμας ἔουκνια.

Whether this be written by Homer or not, it should read thus:

καλὴ Κασσιέπεια δέμας ἔουκνια θεοῖσιν (-ῆσιν).

This is obvious *per se*, and even if there were a doubt, it would be removed by Θ 305. Similarly, transposition has affected θ 355 ὑπὸ χρέος ἀλύξας, η 270 ἡ ῥ' ἔτ' ἔμελλον οὐχίνι ἔννέσεσθαι v. p. 181. But Hesiod has fared worse in this respect—e.g. *Op.* 443:

ὅς κ' ἔργου μελετῶν θεῖαν αὐλακ' ἐλάνον.

This is an absolute outrage, violating grammar, meaning, and metre. It is made worse rather than better by moving κ' into an impossible position after ιθεαται (*Cod. I.* Rzach):

ὅς κ' ιθεαται ἔργου μεληθεῖς αὐλακ' ἐλάνον

would serve every purpose. In *Hes. Catal.* 94, 33 read εἴδος ἐς οὔτι ιδόν sc. οὐτιδῶν. Similarly T 92 ἐπ' οὐδας | πιλναται sc. ἐπιπιλναται. In ξ 289 ἀνθρώπωντις ἔωργει grammar demands ἀνθρώπωντις ἔωργει as also μ 412 κυβερνήτην. ε 7 πλησίαι ἀλλήλησι cf. β 149. Ψ 226 ημος δ' ἀστήρ εἰσι, omitting the gloss. Ω 158 ἀλλ' ικέται μᾶλ' ἐνδυκέως. Ι 319 ἐν δέ τ' ιη τιμῆ, Hesiod *Theog.* 732 *Kroniaw*. What is Poseidon doing *dans cette galère?* B 475 For μυέωσι write μύρ' ἔωσι, or omitting κε, ἀμμυρ' ἔωσι.

My space is now exhausted. I conclude by submitting what I will venture to call the solution of the perennial crux in Δ 146:

τοῖοι τοι, Μενέλαε, μιάνθην αἴματι μηρῷ
εὐφνέες κνήμα τε . . .

μιάνθην is not, as the author here supposes (p. 36), a venture of the poet, because he was placed in a difficulty by μιάνθεν. Read:

τοῖοι τοι, Μενέλαε, μιάνθης αἴματι μηρῷ
εὐφνέες κνήμα τε . . .

T. L. AGAR.

LYRA GRAECA.

Dyra Graeca: Being the Remains of all the Greek Lyric Poets from Eumelus to Timotheus, excepting Pindar, newly edited and translated by J. M. EDMONDS, late Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, in three volumes. Loeb Series. Vol. I.

THIS book, which contains among other things the remains of Terpander, Alcman, Sappho and Alcaeus, newly edited and translated by J. M. Edmonds, will, it is to be hoped, be appreciated by those on whose account the general editors of this series included it. Scholars may perhaps prefer to continue using the texts to which they are accustomed, erroneous as these are in many respects.

It is difficult within the narrow compass of a review to do justice to a book containing so many hundred novelties, but I will endeavour to indicate one or two of its most enlivening characteristics. Mr. Edmonds seems to be the fortunate possessor of a pair of eyes which enable him to discern, sometimes from a mere photograph, what has often deceived or totally escaped the vision of the most expert decipherers working on the manuscript itself. To say nothing of a dozen places in the Paris Alcman, where 'a detailed study of an excellent photograph and . . . a revision in the light of a still better one, kindly sent' him 'by the Bibliothèque Nationale in 1913 and 1914' (p. 50), have produced 'new readings' (*ibid.*) very different from what those who have examined the papyrus in the Louvre had persuaded themselves were the correct ones, I will quote Mr. Edmonds' diploma piece in this kind, which is his number 84 of Sappho. Here Professors Blass and Schubart, even with the help of reagents, were not able to make out more than these few letters:

]ιc . . . εγ (or επ)
]ω
]μοις
]αλιανεχω (or]ιοιδαλεων)
]παρθενων
]ωδω[

I will admit without shame that myself I read with certainty less rather than more. Mr. Edmonds has, from a

photograph, 'tentatively' made out the following:

]ω.
]μοκα,
]λλ' ιαν ηχον
]παρθενιαν,
]ωρρωδων υπερ θν
]ηψι Ηρα βάλεσθαι.
]νφραν' αρ' ωξυβόων δ'.
]παρθεν, α νυξ ονκι βάρυν
]εμμεν' ωστ' ον μη cι γ' άτνξη . . .

A remarkable achievement.

In addition to this keenness of vision Mr. Edmonds is endowed with powers of divination not ordinarily vouchsafed to humanity. To take a single instance, fr. 50 of *P. Oxy.* 1231 contains the following (ll. 5-8):

c]τείχομεν γάρ[
κα]ὶ cι τοῦτ' ἀλλ[
πα]ρ[θ]ένοις ἀπ[
]εν ἔχοιεν

This Mr. Edmonds has been inspired to enlarge to his Sappho, 46, ll. 5-8: c]τείχομεν γάρ [πάντος· ἔγω δὲ φώμεν κα]ὶ cι τοῦτ' · Αλλ[η δύνατον βρότους πα]ρ[θ]ένοις ἀπ[εμμεν ἐκας γυναικων αὶς κ]εν ἔχοιεν [:]

It is fortunate that we are now in a position to do justice to the accuracy of this one of Mr. Edmonds' 'approximations to the truth,' which 'are far from being mere guesses' (Introd., p. viii). Since the tenth Oxyrhynchus volume was published it has been found possible to place several fragments in their proper relation to one another, so that the four lines in question are actually found to read:

c]τείχομεν γάρ []ον, ενθε[
κα]ὶ cι τοῦτ' ἀλλ[τ]άχιστα[
πα]ρ[θ]ένοις ἀπ[π]εμπε, θεοι[
]εν ἔχοιεν

It has hitherto been the view of scholars, both ancient and modern, that Sappho and Alcaeus (whose remains are exposed on pp. 182-307, 318-428) normally composed in the Aeolic dialect of Lesbos. Mr. Edmonds evidently does not unreservedly share this opinion. In many of his emendations and restorations there appear words, forms, and metres which are quite alien to normal

Aeolic usage. As he has nowhere divulged to what dialect they belong, and I have been unable to discover for myself, I will refer to them for convenience as Triballian. That Aeolic and Triballian are quite distinct may be seen by simply turning over the pages. For instance, Aeolic has *πρὸς*, Triballian adds *προτὶ* (S. 1₁₀, 82₁₅, 164₂, etc.). Aeolic says *cv*, *cē*, *ἔγω*, Triballian adds *τὺ*, *τέ*, *ἔγων* (S. 2₇, 38₁₅, 83₉, 15₁). Aeolic says *ἔων*, Triballian adds *ἔις* and *Ἄν* (S. 58, A. 27₇, etc.), Aeolic *πόνησαι*, Triballian also *ποίησαι* (S. 89₁; the -ou forms of *ποιεῖν* are never found in Alcaeus or Sappho). Aeolic has only *φάος*, *ἔργον*, *κάλα*, *γῶν*, Triballian also *φάνος* (S. 85₁₄), *ὄργον* (A. 27₃), *κάλα* (S. 65₃), and *γίαν* (e.g. S. 94₃; it appears to have a special taste for this word). There are, of course, some Triballian words which never occur in Aeolic at all. Again, in Aeolic the imperfect of *ἀλέματι* would appear as *ἀλήμαν*, in Triballian it is *ἀλλέμαν* (p. 252 n.), and similarly *ἡλγεῖ* (S. 41₁) seems to be Triballian for *ἄλγη*. Aeolic has infinitives in -ην, as *πώνην*, Triballian also in -εμεν, as *πώνεμεν* (A. 164₅). In Aeolic *o+a* contract to *ω*, as in *ώνηρ* (for *ό ἀνήρ*), but the Triballian form resembles the Attic; thus *τὸ αἴρητον* becomes *ταΐρητον* (S. 85₁₃). Aeolic rejects hiatus; Triballian welcomes such collocations as *κεῦ ἐποίησα* (S. 89₁) and *ἄνει ἀρέτας* (S. 100₁). Finally, for a specimen of Triballian metre I may refer to his number 82 of Sappho, unless indeed that is a prose poem.

These facts will have to be investi-

gated by students of Greek dialects with more attention than they have hitherto received.

In conclusion, a brief reference may be made to Mr. Edmonds' 'palaeographical method,' which 'consists of the tracing of letter-groups from photographs of the extant portions of the papyrus or vellum MS.' (Introd., p. ix) in order to ensure that the written length of supplements shall not be greater or less than the gap which they are meant to fill admits. Scholars have, perhaps, themselves not been blind to the fact that it is imprudent to insert in a gap more or fewer letters than it will properly hold. But since Mr. Edmonds takes the trouble to enunciate the proposition, it is a little unexpected to find that he does not pay heed to it. For instance, in line 18 of his number 36 of Sappho (*κύνν['] ἔ]ρε-*), *κυν[ε]ρ*, as he assumes the scribe wrote (inviting one to compare *Ὥρανος* and *Ὥρρανος* for the single *v*), does not nearly fill the lacuna, unless, of course, there were a special *v* about one and a half times the usual width.

But perhaps scholars will be willing to forgive this oversight for the sake of the delightful discovery *κύννα*.

Mr. Edmonds, for anything I know, may have a genuine enthusiasm for the authors he edits. But caution also is requisite in handling fragmentary texts—caution and commonsense, and a critical, especially a self-critical, habit.

E. LOBEL.

*The Queen's College,
Oxford.*

PLOTIN.

Plotin. By FRITZ HEINEMANN. One vol. 4to. Pp. 318. Leipzig: F. Meiner, 1921. M. 10.

THIS is unquestionably an important contribution to Neoplatonic studies. Heinemann reverts to the older view of Neoplatonism—that it is 'a syncretism of Hellenism and Orientalism under the form of Hellenism, a fusion of philosophy and religion under the dominion of philosophy,' as the Christian Alexandrianism is 'a syncretism of Hellenism and Orientalism under the form of

Orientalism, a fusion of philosophy and religion under the dominion of religion.' True Greek philosophy, in his opinion, ends with the scepticism of the Academics; the later Platonism is a new development, with a double source.

I do not find Heinemann's treatment of the philosophy entirely satisfactory. To say that the One is 'the unity of the rational and the irrational' is, I think, misleading. The mystical vision no doubt transcends the discursive reason, but it is not on that account irrational.

There is, in fact, no room for the irrational in the philosophy of Plotinus. Nor do I see any clear trace of 'Iranian influence' in his treatment of the problem of evil.

The most important feature of the book is a new rearrangement of the *Enneads* in order of their composition. Rejecting the order of Porphyry's recension, and also that of Kirchhoff's edition, Heinemann has subjected the whole work to a careful scrutiny for marks of anteriority and posteriority, and thinks that he has restored the original order. He is also convinced that the *Enneads* contain many later interpolations, sometimes of considerable length. Some of these additions, he thinks, are due to Porphyry, others to Amelius; he even traces here and there the hand of Eustochius the physician.

There is nothing improbable in the theory of displacements and interpolations when we remember the manner in which the *Enneads* were composed. Heinemann has shown great acuteness in the work of rearrangement, and seems often to have proved his case, though without a careful re-reading of the whole work it would be rash to pronounce a decided opinion.

If the *Enneads* represented only the most mature state of Plotinus' philosophy, the order of the books would not matter very much. But Heinemann is convinced that in Porphyry's recension we have, jumbled together, several stages in the development of the philosopher's system. He goes so far as to say that Plotinus in his earliest writings was a Platonist, in his later an Alexandrine. Neoplatonism, as he took it over from Ammonius Saccas, was a kind of secret society in close connexion with the mysteries; it was a combination of Platonism and Neopythagoreanism. Ammonius knew nothing of the Plotinian 'One,' and in the earliest books of the *Enneads* we do not find it either. The leading ideas in this first period are the immortality of the soul, the intelligible world, the escape of the soul from the region of becoming to that of being—all genuine parts of Plato's doctrine. Only, like a child of his time, Plotinus aspires to identity with God, instead of Plato's *ōμοιωσις*. Heinemann

adds that the idea of *Noūs* is also wanting in the earliest books. The 'second period' (262-267 A.D.) was, he says, the most flourishing time of the school, and also of the genius of Plotinus. It is in the books which on critical grounds must be assigned to these years that we find the system in its most perfect form. In this period Plotinus is moving towards a doctrine of immanence, but he never reaches the 'dynamic pantheism' which Zeller ascribes to him. 'Nature,' in this period, is rather *natura naturans* than *natura naturata*. In the third period, Heinemann agrees with Porphyry, Plotinus was getting old, and the social order around him was breaking up. The main interest of the philosopher in his declining years was to establish a theodicy, and Heinemann thinks that he is ready to make terms with metaphysical dualism.

It cannot be denied that this theory of progressive changes in the thought of Plotinus provides a plausible explanation of certain inconsistencies and contradictions, some of which I noticed in my work upon the *Enneads*. For instance, the conceptions of *δύναμις* and *ἐπέρευεια* are handled in a confusing manner. The question as to the logical priority of *νόησις* or of *νοητά* is raised repeatedly, and the answers cannot be completely reconciled. And in some chapters a very exalted place is given to the category of *ζωή*, which threatens to interfere with the triad of divine principles. But I think that Heinemann has exaggerated the changes which he finds in the thought of the philosopher. We have to remember that the *Enneads* were very carefully overhauled by the later members of the school, men as competent as Iamblichus and Proclus, not to speak of Porphyry himself; and we do not find the 'most divine' Plotinus accused of such vacillation as Heinemann discovers in him. I suspect that the rearrangement of the text has sometimes been influenced by the desire to prove an evolution of thought in a certain direction. However, as I have said, only a thorough study of the whole work in the light of the new theories can decide how far we must admit that Heinemann has proved his case.

W. R. INGE.

MENANDER.

Menander (Loeb edition). The principal fragments, with an English translation, by F. G. ALLINSON. Pp. xxxii + 540; illustrations, 2. London and New York: Heinemann. 10s. PROBABLY no other classical author has been hitherto so inaccessible in an English edition as Menander. The appearance of this Loeb edition will be welcomed by all. It contains everything of value that has been written to elucidate the most important fragments.

The General Introduction comprises discussions on Menander's life, on the New Comedy and its vocabulary and style, a history of the text, and an admirable bibliography. The editor's own judgment on his author is guardedly expressed as follows: 'The verdict passed upon Menander by the Greeks and Romans who possessed the great corpus of his unmitigated works, if due allowance for the personal equation is made, is probably not out of accord with some portions, at least, of what we have at our disposal.' Language of this kind is safer than that which would place Menander among the 'penny-a-line' brotherhood in the face of the splendid compliments he received from competent judges of antiquity. In a similar spirit of restraint the editor has rarely made any emendations of the text, being content to adopt what seems to him to be the best work of other critics. When he does attempt a restoration he is nearly always convincing. An admirable example of his work is to be found in the *Arbitrants*, l. 392:

(A.) οὐδεὶς Σικελίκος ἔτερος ἴμιν (Σμικ.) ποικίλον ἀριστον ἀριστονιν.

This most happy conjecture *Σικελίκος* is backed up by a quotation of an exactly parallel passage in the *Republic*: *Σικελίκη ποικίλαν ὄφων*.

The newly discovered fragments rightly occupy the first place. Each of them is preceded by short outline of the plot as far as it can be reconstructed, and a description of the textual difficulties where necessary. The first play is the *Arbitrants*, such being the generally accepted rendering of the word 'Ἐπιτρέποντες'. What should be the real order of the fragments is a problem of well-known intricacy, on which there can be as yet no consensus of opinion. Professor Allinson prefixes to the play the 'St. Petersburg' fragments, which were assigned to

another play by the editor of the Teubner edition. In these fragments there is an indication of a chorus after l. 35; accordingly, we have part of Act i. and the opening lines of Act ii. The Cairo fragments then follow, containing the most lively portion of the play. In them the mainspring of the plot is indicated. The *dénouement* cannot be determined until the order of several most important minor fragments has been settled. The discovery of *Oxyrh.* 1236 made the Teubner arrangement untenable: a similar find may upset the Loeb order; but the editor has given excellent reasons for the order he adopts after much hesitation, and with an admission that his scheme can be only probable.

The other plays do not present so acutely the problem of arrangement. The excellent introductions offer all the information that is necessary for the understanding of the plot. The few well-chosen remarks on the metrical Argument of the Hero are worth attention, while the perplexing question as to the *dramatis personae* in the *Γεωργός* is stated with admirable brevity. The remainder of the book includes what, in the editor's judgment, are the most noteworthy of the fragments previously known.

But the metrical version is certain to provoke criticism. The editor has attempted a translation in the original metres. Yet he is not quite consistent: the *Τεωρύος* and the *Κιβωτοῦς*, though new, are in prose, while some of the older fragments are in verse. A prose translation would have been safer. The English six-foot iambic is doomed: even the skill shown in this translation has not saved the metre from the fatal break at the end of the third foot: weak words are bound to appear in strong positions, and even the colloquial license of comedy cannot excuse the presence of these words in English verse. In one or two places the vocabulary sinks almost to the level of slang. One instance will suffice:

'Right you are. Yes, that's my lay.'

It would be unfair to allow this defect to prejudice the reader. The volume is the work of one of the best living authorities on Menander. It is conservative, even when some slight change should have been made: it has an English translation, and is a worthy addition to the admirable Loeb series.

T. W. LUMB.

'A HOTCHPOTCH OF ALL SORTS OF FISHES.'

Fishing from the Earliest Times. By WILLIAM RADCLIFFE. One vol. Pp. xvii + 478. John Murray, 1921. 28s. We hope that Mr. Radcliffe will not take the quotation, which heads this notice, otherwise than as a compliment to his delightful volume. 'Indeed, a rich and savoury stew 'tis.' Strike in your reviewer's flesh-hook (or Leister) where you will, and you impale some

appetising morsel. Unhappily, considerations of space forbid our exhibiting more than a very scanty selection from the good things provided.

The chapters relating to Greek and Roman fishing, to which our purview is confined, cover a period in relation to which the earliest 'document' cited by our author is the Fishermen's Vase of Phylakopi (say 1500 B.C.), and the

latest are the writings of Sidonius Apollinaris in the fifth century A.D. Sidonius, by the way, had an unholy addiction to night-lining, unbecoming a successor of the Apostles!

Mr. Radcliffe discusses the question as to how far fish was in esteem as a food in the Homeric age. There seems to be in Homer no mention of fish at banquets nor in well-to-do houses. The catching of fish, speaking broadly, occurs only in connexion with poverty or starvation. On the other side must be set the solitary mention of oysters in the XVIth *Iliad* and the reference in the XIXth *Odyssey* to the blameless king under whose reign 'the sea gives store of fish,' though the oysters ought perhaps only to be regarded as supplementing the scanty rations of a crew at sea. Too much may be made of the absence of mention of fish. Most of the meals chronicled by Homer are associated with a sacrifice, and the feasters (like Porthos at the table of Louis XIV.) would prefer to reserve all available gastric space for the more delectable roast meats. We may, perhaps, from Homer's knowledge of various methods of capturing fish infer that, except on occasions worthy of epic commemoration, fish formed no negligible part of the diet of the population, gentle as well as simple. Mr. Radcliffe discusses, of course, the question as to what Homer meant by the phrase *κέρας βοὸς ἄγραιλοιο*. This appears to have puzzled even the Stagirite, though he had his own explanation to offer: it was a collar of horn protecting the line from being bitten through. Mr. Radcliffe enumerates upwards of half a dozen diverse explanations. He himself appears to incline to the suggestion of Mr. Haskyns, in the *Journal of Philology*, that the *κέρας* was an artificial bait of horn; and perhaps its conjunction with the sinker (*μολύβδαινα*) in the XXIVth *Iliad* may make in favour of this view rather than of the 'collar' interpretation favoured by Aristotle.

That wondrous man was the first who suggested that the age of a fish could be discovered by an examination of its scales. The late Mr. P. D. Malloch (who, probably, like the old hermit of

Prague, had never read Aristotle) advanced in his book on the *History and Habits of the Salmon*, etc. (1910), far more extensive claims for the science of 'scale-reading' than the modest pretensions of the tutor of Alexander.

When we turn to the Romans we find ourselves among fresh-water as well as sea fishers. Save for the Copaic eels, the Greeks appear mostly concerned with sea-fishing.

Martial was evidently a keen fisher; and here two most interesting questions arise. Did he use a jointed fishing-rod? and did he fish with the fly? (In passing, we must protest against the reference in a note on page 144 to Martial's neighbour at Nomentum, Quintus Ovidius, as 'Ovid.' We do not call the antagonists of the Curiatii 'the Horaces,' in spite of Corneille!)

Was the 'crescens arundo' of Martial, *Epf.* IX. 54. 3, a jointed rod? And was it a fishing-rod? The whole epigram seems to refer clearly to fowling, and we think Mr. Radcliffe is right in answering the first question in the affirmative and the second in the negative. It must, we fear, be admitted that there is no actual evidence of the jointed rod being used for angling in Roman times.

Namque quis nescit
Avidum vorata decipi scarum musca.
Martial, *Epf.* V. 18.

There is no MSS. support for the suggested reading 'musco,' and 'Emen-dationes non multiplicandae praeter necessitatem.' Here, in Martial, we may safely say, we have the earliest reference to the fly, natural or artificial. Arrian (170-230 A.D.) gives an account of the use of the artificial fly in the Macedonian river Astraeus, and a list of materials for fly tying, which are of the highest interest to the scholar angler. These Mr. Radcliffe gives at length in translation. He also cites from Pliny's *Reports* (not a book of recognised authority) an extraordinary litigation between two co-adventurers in the 'Anthias' fishery, with some learned legal observations thereon by Professor Courtney Kenney. But one is inclined to ask whether the report in Pliny is anything but apocryphal.

F. W. PEMBER.

GREEK HERO CULTS AND IDEAS OF IMMORTALITY.

Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality. The Gifford Lectures delivered in the University of St. Andrews in the year 1920. By L. R. FARRELL. One vol. 8vo. Pp. xv + 434. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1921. 18s.

THOUGH differing slightly in form from its predecessors, the concluding volume of the *Cults of the Greek States* is in no way their inferior. It is marked by the same wide learning and the same common sense. Dr. Farnell is indeed to be congratulated upon the completion of a very notable contribution to scholarship. His work has an assured position as a classic. It may, therefore, be hoped that, now he has reached the limit of his projected survey, he may find time to prepare a second edition of the earlier volumes. A revision is needed; for archaeological discovery, since they were written, has altered the nature of some of the problems, and they contain views which the author himself no longer holds. In such cases the author is necessarily the best editor. That the Mycenaean worshipped the distinguished dead may be regarded as certain, though the evidence for the view that the dead were objects of their love rather than of their fear is more questionable. It is with Homer that the serious difficulties begin, and Dr. Farnell is wisely cautious. The evidence is in itself inconsistent, and its reading depends upon what view is taken of the unity and date of the poems. There is the further question, For whom does Homer speak? For the northern invaders in general, for a particular branch of the northerners, or only for a sceptical aristocratic class? The *Iliad*, at any rate, contains no evidence for the worship of the dead, and an additional reason may be given for distrusting the significance attached by Rohde to the funeral rites of Patroclus. That there is no mention of cult at Homeric barrows, and that the motive for erecting them is explicitly attributed to the desire for posthumous secular fame, would seem to be as decisive as the nature of negative evidence permits. But the author of the *Odyssey* knows of hero cults, and the writer of the

XIth book had evidently visited a νεκυομαρτεῖον.

Whatever survivals there may have been from the Bronze Age, there is little doubt that the majority of Greek hero cults are post-Homeric; many, as Dr. Farnell shows, are directly the product of epic influence. For some reason or other hero-worship became for a time the dominating impulse in religion, and Delphi encouraged the vogue. By the middle of the sixth century the scramble for relics as state talismans had become popular. Was this perhaps in part the product of a reflex influence from the colonial practice of worship at the oikist's tomb?

As a whole this great movement receives less discussion than it deserves, and a chapter extending the general survey beyond the prehistoric period would have been welcome. Similar religious movements are of course to be found in the history of Christianity and Islam, and analogy suggests that in periods when a wave of saint-worship reaches its height, saints tend to usurp local minor cults, or the objects of such cults tend to be metamorphosed into saints. The latter process no doubt explains the conversion of local deities like Trophonios into heroes. The former is not perhaps sufficiently taken into account by Dr. Farnell. One may agree that the Oropian cult does not justify the view that Amphiaraos was a faded deity without impugning the antiquity of the local holy place. It is quite possible that at the height of the popularity of hero-worship the name of the Boeotian hero, in himself as historical a person as St. Peter, became attached to a pre-existing cult. The identification of particular saints with particular cults is often due to quite arbitrary or accidental causes, and is by no means always determined by the character of the saint. Similarly, we might agree that Helen is an epic heroine, not a faded goddess, and yet believe that her name became attached at Sparta and Rhodes to local cults of a nature goddess. The Menelaion was situated in the Bronze Age settlement, which the invaders of Laconia destroyed, and the

cult was inherited by them from the Late Mycenaean period. The finds suggested to the excavators that the female object of worship was a divinity of the same type as Artemis Orthia and was the more important of the two powers known in the cult of historical times as Menelaos and Helen (*B.S.A.*, vols. xv. and xvi.). There is no trace of a cult of Menelaos in the *Iliad*; there is a probable indication, though inconclusive as regards actual cult, in the *Odyssey*. If we believe that Helen and Menelaos are epic persons, and that their cult is subsequent to Homer, or at any rate to the *Iliad*, it would seem to follow that their names became attached at Sparta to a cult already in existence—unless, of course, Homer was current in the L. M. III. period, and Greek epic was already exercising an influence upon cult. That is not perhaps out of the question, but our present knowledge would hardly justify its assumption as a working hypothesis.

Dr. Farnell's treatment of the tendency of the family dead is judicious, and his caution in speaking of ancestor worship is justified by the obvious analogy between the Athenian *γούες* and the undifferentiated group of dead, Manes, of early Rome. If the Roman analogy is admitted as sound, a prejudice is created against the sacramental

explanation of *τεριδειπνον* and *καθέδρα*. The evidence of Artemidorus and Photius carries little weight, and there is no trace of sacrament in the *Cara Cognatio* (*Caristia*). Roman analogy again leads one to view with suspicion the argument that the state hearth tended by the daughters of the King has any necessary connection with ancestor worship.

The main part of the book is naturally occupied with an exhaustive examination of particular hero cults. In each case the current theories are tested by their applicability to the ascertainable facts. The result is to rehabilitate the authority of saga tradition against arbitrary methods of interpretation. Solar, stellar, and hieratic mythologists receive no quarter. The detailed discussions are full of suggestive matter, and contain much that is of importance for the secular as well as for the religious history of Greece.

Two chapters are perhaps open to criticism of a general kind. In chapter iv. the author is a little carried away by the excitement of demolishing Usener to the detriment of his exposition, and the last chapter dealing with the belief in immortality suffers, particularly as regards the latter half, from presentation upon a scale inadequate to the subject. W. R. HALLIDAY.

BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE DES ETRUSKISCHEN, LATEINISCHEN UND GRIECHISCHEN ALPHABETS.

Beiträge zur Geschichte des Etruskischen, Lateinischen und Griechischen Alphabets. By M. HAMMARSTRÖM. One vol. 4to. Pp. 58. Helsingfors.

THIS dissertation is a competent and valuable discussion, in the light of the most recent evidence, of the origin of the chief alphabets used in ancient Italy, and deserves the careful attention of all students of early Italian civilisation and of Greek epigraphy. Written by an able pupil of Professors Danielsson and Sundwall, it is a welcome sign that the material which has been admirably put together by Pauli, Danielsson, and Herbig in the *Corp. Inscc. Etruscarum* is being profitably used. The two most important conclusions of the investigation are:

1. That the Latin alphabet may be more truly described as derived from the Etruscan with additions from the Greek alphabet, than as derived from the Greek alphabet with modifications due to Etruscan influence, which has been the current view.

2. That the Etruscan alphabet itself was probably not derived, as has hitherto been supposed, from the alphabet of the Greek colony, Cumae (for whose foundation the author accepts the date 720 B.C.), but shows much greater affinities with the alphabets of Corinth and Phocis, which may have reached Italy even before the foundation of Cumae.

One of the most interesting points showing the close connection between

the Latin and the Etruscan alphabets is the fact which Dr. Hammarström, following Schulze, has established, by a careful examination of the statements of the ancient grammarians, that the Latin names for the letters of the alphabet, and consequently the English names for them (except of course that of the letter H), are derived from the names which the Etruscans gave to the letters. It is unlucky that this very important exposition is obscured by the use of a new and curious term *lautieren* from p. 20 onwards, which is finally explained on p. 27; it means to pronounce a letter which denotes a liquid or a fricative with its own sound only, not adding any vowel before or after.

Incidentally the author discusses, generally with convincing effect, many problems of the history of the Greek alphabets, such as the double value of the symbol X in the Eastern and Western groups, although here and there the scantiness of the evidence, as for the earliest value of the symbol H, drives the writer back into the region of conjecture.

If I am right in taking it for the author's first published work it deserves a cordial welcome for its scholarly care

and completeness, although like the work of most young scholars it is often rather obscure. An eager student often fails to realise that the rest of the world, even that section of it to which his work is especially addressed, may not be familiar with many technicalities in local use; and that what to him seems a natural form of expression may be only a piece of lecture-room slang, by no means intelligible outside. How many English readers, I wonder, would see through the phrase 'the red alphabets,' followed a good many pages later by 'the blue alphabets' and 'the light blue alphabets'? A search through Kirchhoff showed that the writer meant by these phrases merely the alphabets used in the districts which Kirchhoff had, in his alphabet-map in 1887, marked with these particular colours! No doubt the names 'Eastern' and 'Western' are far from satisfactory; but they at least suggest some part of the truth.

The reader must be prepared for the old riddling symbols 'bez.' and 'ev.'; though 'm.E.' and 'resp.' appear to be mercifully absent. But 'm.a.W.' in the sense of the Latin *nempe* after a full stop is a new terror to life!

R. S. CONWAY.

PRO MILONE, CAESARIANAE, PHILIPPICAE.

Clark's Cicero: *Pro Milone, Caesarianae, Philippicae*. Second edition. Oxford Classical texts.

THE first edition of this volume of the Oxford text of Cicero appeared as long ago as 1900. Since that date a good deal of important material has accrued, and the first edition has, as the editor says frankly, become more or less obsolete. The present edition, as might be expected by anyone who knows the course of criticism in the last twenty years, and the nature of Professor Clark, is not so much a revision as a new book. When it is said that the new book possesses all the qualities which habitually distinguish Professor Clark's work, it is, perhaps, sufficiently praised; and the most useful task which a reviewer can perform will be to indicate the main lines of divergence from the earlier

edition. For this purpose not much need be said of the Caesarian Orations. In these the Apparatus is based upon the same MSS. as were employed in the earlier edition (for our first knowledge of many of which we are indebted to Professor Clark), the *a* family being, however, reinforced by the all-important Holkham or Cluny MS. In the *Milo* we work back to the Cluny MS., through the Excerpts of Bartolomeo di Montepulciano, and the variants offered by the second hand of the Paris MS. 14749 (Σ). These two sources supply the principal part of the new material for the Apparatus of the second edition, reaffirming the outstanding importance among the other codices of Harley 2682. The only other additions to the MSS. which Professor Clark previously employed are (1) the Laurentian XXIII.

Sin. 3 (which owes its interest to the fact that it is the best representative of the class of MSS. current in Italy before Poggio brought home the Cluny MS.), and (2) *Marcianus 255*, the best of the *recentiores*.

The new text of the *Philippics* is based upon a fresh collation of *V*, the Vatican MS. *H 25*. At the same time, the reconstitution of the *D* family is carried through somewhat differently from what was attempted in the first edition. Collations are presented of two Vatican MSS., 3228 and 3227, of the eleventh and twelfth centuries respectively. Of these the latter is collated fully only for the later speeches, where the need is serious, and where the Apparatus is further reinforced by the (Paris) Brussels MS. 14492. The Codex Regius, *I*, is now regarded by Professor Clark as derived from Vat. 3228, and accordingly ceases to be a primary authority for the reconstitution of *D*.

Having reconstituted *D*, Professor Clark sets himself a task in which he takes characteristic enjoyment. Both

D and *V* go back to a single archetype. *V*, as is well known, is a three-column MS., and Professor Clark can tell the reader how many lines there were to the column in its exemplar, and how many letters to the line, and all else that might be expected from the author of the *Descent of Manuscripts*. But he is not going to rest at that. He can do the same by the common original of the *D* MSS.; and he applies his *ratio arithmeticæ* to the reconstitution of the Archetype with all the gaiety of a mature scholarship.

The new text is not unaccompanied by new essays in textual emendation. These I may leave the reader to search out for himself. But among new and ingenious suggestions I may perhaps single out Phil. V. 13, *Cydam amo Cretensem*, where the supplement *amo* illustrates a type of emendation for which Professor Clark has, I think, a particular fancy.

People hate buying second editions. But this one is necessary and worth it.

H. W. GARROD.

ALLITERATIO LATINA; OR, ALLITERATION IN LATIN VERSE REDUCED TO RULE.

Allitteratio Latina; or, Alliteration in Latin Verse reduced to Rule. By WALTER J. EVANS, M.A. Pp. xxxiv + 195. Williams and Norgate, 1921. 18s.

PENTAMETERS have commonly an internal rhyme; Virgil is alive with alliteration, some of it (the archaic) so thumped that even Conington—whose ear was wooden—remarked upon it. Roiron explored the symbolic significance of it in his *Imagination auditive de V.* But since we read little aloud and learn less by heart, even in Virgil we neglect the colours of the pattern of sound. Just as the Philistine will hear nothing in English verse but the rhymes, so we have been apt to recognise nothing but quantity in Latin verse. Mr. Evans sets out to show that Rhyme (which term includes all sorts of alliteration) was a necessary part of the Latin poet's business; and to draw out the rules which governed it. Accept or refuse his results, his book does give a

new insight into the mysteries of *compositio verborum*. But it leaves many puzzles to solve. Was Rhyme in Latin a surface feature, strictly regulated, as in Welsh? or an ubiquitous, but unobtrusive grace, like alliteration in English? Of course, good verse in English is no more free in alliteration than in quantity. A lay ear may only detect rhyme and prosody, but an adept is aware of the vowel-play and consonant-play. Was it so in Latin? Every schoolboy learned to scan, but would he perceive—or be expected to perceive—defect of 'rhyme'?

Rhyme being understood in the widest possible acceptation, Mr. Evans allows (p. 5) that it is 'difficult to construct a long line without a single rhyme,' and that the minimum of rhyme required was low. (Why he should call 'mere-tricious' whatever exceeds the minimum, I do not see.) This is the point against which *Advocatus Diaboli* will direct the sceptical attack.

Summarised, his discovery is that 'subject to certain indulgences, every 'ictic' syllable must rhyme with some other 'ictic' syllable in its own line' (p. 43). An 'ictic' syllable is defined (p. 21) as 'a vowel on which the ictus falls, together with all the consonants on either side that can be conveniently pronounced with it.' He does not assert that rhyme was reckoned only by ictic syllables, but predominantly. (I am not satisfied that he takes account of word-accent. There seem to me to be many verses in which the position of the caesuras keeps important rhymes out of the 'ictics'—e.g.:

uis aperit clausos una puerula lares.)

A rhyme means 'the echo of at least one effective letter.' He allows five 'indulgences':

(1) The 'uniped.' This creature is a rhyme internal to the foot—e.g.:

noscitur ab omnibus
pauperi recluditur.

Doubles are excluded: 'annus, ossa' do not give a rhyme.

(2) The 'oblique' (oddly named)—i.e. a rhyme from an ictic letter to a non-ictic when this is the initial of a word—e.g.:

Romulus et mensas.

I doubt the justice of treating this as exceptional. Take, for instance, a very full-dress passage such as Hor. *Epist. II. 1*; in a line such as

si LONGO sermONE mORer tua tempORA
Caesar

would not Mr. Evans' analysis miss the very marked rhymes which I indicate in capitals and italics? *Longo* is emphatic; its emphasis must have appeared in pronunciation, whether in verse or in prose; does not Horace mark its importance (and that of *morer*) by providing each with a rhyme?

(3) The 'interlineal': chiefly got by enjambment of the last foot of one line with the first of another. One may guess that analysis will find that the difference between the Catulline or the Ovidian (*κατὰ στίχον*) hexameter, and that of Virgil, lies in V.'s fondness for 'interlinear rhymes,' which belong to constructed verse-periods.

(4) 'When a foot shows none of these

NO. CCLXXXVI. VOL. XXXVI.

four sorts of rhyme, it is a blank foot in the strictest sense of the term.' In such cases there must be compensation by initial rhymes.

One of the author's examples he calls 'such a lean hexameter as would be hard to parallel': it is Catull. LXVIII. 105. It seems to me to have a rich and abundant pattern of sound, only the melody (so to say) sometimes goes into the base:

quo tibi tum casu pULCerrima Laudamia
ereptumst uita dULCiis atque anima.

He gives the line three blanks. Is it conceivable that -*ima*, -*mia*, -*ma* are not of design? I believe that 'casu' rhymes with 'Laudamia';¹ and that, despite difference of quantity, 'pulcerima' was echoed in 'ereptum.' Two points that would require the reviewing of a great body of evidence: but Mr. E.'s ruling (on p. 4) does not satisfy me.

(5) 'The first and last lines of a lyric (having less than six ictuses) may each have one blank foot.' This category (the 'Privileged' line) seems to me unnecessary: all the examples would yield to treatment or explanation. The author admits they are quite few.

This in brief outline is the theory, as important for the appreciation of Latin verse as the theory of rhythm has been for prose. Mr. Evans' vast and minute labour has not been wasted: a new chapter is added to the study of each Latin poet's style. (The young thesis-writer will not want for subjects that will give him insight as well as results.) The theory will be complemented and probably modified in restatement, but he deserves thanks and applauses which salute his nation as well as himself—since in the practice of Welsh poetry he found his clue. It is a real discovery of something that 'oft was thought, but ne'er . . . in form . . . exprest.'

Phoneticians will perhaps question his decisions on points of pronunciation (I find his account of *f* hard to accept!) values of letters, syllabification, etc. And a good many corrections in detail would improve a second edition. A new terminology is apt to irritate, and

¹ Perhaps the syllable -sup- is left blank by a compensation of a different sort—viz., just because *ca-* has its rhyme.

one may find 'ictic' an ugly hybrid, but mostly the author's coinages are modest; but I wish he would proscribe *arsis* and *thesis* (which he himself admits are equivocal) and adopt the unambiguous terms of the French metrists *fort* and *faible*. On p. 23 Tennyson's alcaics are

maimed by losing a word; on p. 29 the note about Ausonius is a delusion—the iambics follow in the next piece; on p. 32 Meredith's galliambics might be quoted; on p. 1 the French anagrammatic verses are shockingly misprinted.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

CATALOGUE OF THE ACROPOLIS MUSEUM.

Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum. Vol. II.: Sculpture and Architectural Fragments. By STANLEY CASSON. With a section upon the Terracottas by DOROTHY BROOKE. Pp. x + 459. Profusely illustrated in half-tone. Cambridge: University Press, 1921. £1 16s.

THE first volume of the *Acropolis Catalogue*, by Guy Dickins, set a high standard. The second and concluding volume, which deals with the sculpture of the post-archaic periods, and with the terracottas of all periods, maintains that standard. It is a careful and useful piece of work, highly creditable to the authors and to the British School.

Mr. Casson's material falls into four groups: the sculptures of the Parthenon, the sculptures of the Erechtheum, the balustrade of the Temple of Athena Nike, and a miscellaneous lot of statues and reliefs, mostly fragmentary, ranging from the second half of the fifth century to Roman times. A wide field to cover. The illustrations are less numerous than in the former volume, but more would have made the book unwieldy. One or two pieces are published for the first time; for example, a female head from one of the metopes of the Parthenon (p. 96), and another, fragmentary, from the frieze (p. 138). The bibliographies are large, but not arranged chronologically, and not, perhaps not meant to be, exhaustive. The most serious omission is the lack of references to the plates in Brunn-Bruckmann, where some of the more important marbles from the Parthenon, from the Balustrade, and above all from the Erechtheum, are published better than anywhere else; and to Arndt and Amelung's *Einzelaufnahmen*, which include a number of pieces from the Acropolis less adequately

reproduced, or not at all, elsewhere (*Einzelaufnahmen*, Nos. 725 to 734, and 1274 to 1287).

The following are the points which seem to me open to criticism in Mr. Casson's account of the sculptures; not many in more than three hundred pages. P. 31, the bronze herm signed by Boethos is not a replica of a work by Alcamenes. P. 39, the first torso is not W but V. P. 104, three lines from the end, 'figures' is a slip for 'faces.' P. 106, line 12, 'right' should be 'left'; the second figure is almost certainly, I suppose, Apollo, and the third Artemis rather than Peitho or Demeter. P. 110, Pl. xli. is the right reference for 860. Pp. 111-112, the riders are wearing chlamydes not himatia. Pp. 112-113, the youths are carrying hydriai not amphorae. P. 115, lxxix., under 867, should be lxxx. P. 118, the warrior wears a corslet as well as a chiton. P. 121, the first lyre player wears chiton as well as himation. P. 144, the slab published by Miss Harrison is not 3 but 11. P. 147, did anyone ever take two hands to carry a greave? P. 148, No. 7 has either a kolpos or a kolpos with an overfall. P. 150, the chiton is girt underneath a short kolpos. P. 176, the right-hand figure has a short kolpos as well as an overfall. P. 229, the reference in *Annali* is Pl. N.: the plate is reproduced, and similar subjects discussed, by Studniczka, *Kalamis*, p. 28; the plate gives the fifth figure a chiton as well as a himation, whether rightly or wrongly; the wild attitudes of the women make it unlikely that they are Muses. Pp. 243-248, Mr. Casson speaks of Nos. 1341-1341 γ as fragments of a single relief, perhaps containing six figures; the general view has been that they come from two or three different replicas. The

Acropolis and Chiaramonti reliefs cannot be said to be derived from Acropolis 702; the most that can be said is that the original of the later reliefs stood in the same line of tradition as the sixth-century work. It might have been well to mention the theory, which has found favour, that the relief seen by Pausanias was the work of the Boeotian sculptor Socrates; see, for example, Amelung in Helbig's *Führer I*, pp. 48-50. Pp. 248-250, No. 1345, the relief is mentioned, and the type of drapery discussed, by Studniczka, *Kalamis*, p. 27 ff. P. 253, No. 1348, the hand may have held a sceptre, rather than a spear: it is hard to see how the two letters, which are all that remain of the inscription, can show the relief to be not earlier than 403 B.C.; eta is frequently found on Attic stones before the archonship of Eucleides. Pp. 257-259, the so-called Procne: 'Michaelis points out that Alcamenes was only the dedicator and not the artist'; this should run, 'not necessarily the artist.' 'The group is compared with the so-called Leucothea of the Munich Glyptothek and with the Irene of Képhisodotus or the Hestia Giustiniani.' The 'Leucothea' is the same statue as the Irene: I do not know who compared the Procne with the Hestia; he must have been joking. P. 272, No. 3014, the object in the man's hand can hardly be a patera, judging by the way he holds it; I doubt whether a parallel could be found among the many thousands of representations of paterae

in ancient art. P. 284, the potter (not vase-painter) Andokides flourished in the second half of the sixth century; 'fifth' is obviously a slip. P. 309, the pinax can hardly be later than 500, to judge from the vases cited by Mr. Casson: further, to speak of Euthymides as belonging to the circle of Epictetus is like speaking of Van der Goes as belonging to the circle of Memling; the phrase, however, is Dr. Hoppin's, not Mr. Casson's. Pp. 310-313, if the pithos recalls the vases of the Epictetan circle, 'the later decades of the first half of the fifth century' is not early enough for it; as to the subject, the warriors on the pithos, and on all the monuments compared with it, are not apobatai, but fighters mounting the chariot—parabatai if you like.

Mrs. Brooke's careful description of the terracottas is a valuable contribution to the study of these important monuments.

Misprints.—P. 2, a line seems to have fallen out between line 17 and 18, making Amphitrite into a monster. P. 13, κατατεξέχνος. P. 241, Πορριχίστας. P. 401, Grean for Gréau. Agraula, Caracallus, hydriophorai, kanephorai, παρύθη, all throughout.

Both Mr. Casson and Mrs. Brooke confine 'in' to the most strictly local signification ('in London'), and use 'in the case of' for the other senses, and freely besides. So do nearly all our archaeologists: I often wonder why.

J. D. BEAZLEY.

APICIUS' COOKERY-BOOK.

Apicius 'de re coquinaria.' Ediderunt C. GIARRATANO et FR. VOLLMER. Pp. 96. Leipzig: Teubner, 1922. WHEN an editor has boasted that he has 'no inkling of "Ueberlieferungsgeschichte,"' it seems natural that his divination is now criticised as 'mere waste of time.'

The help of U. to an editor is illustrated by this, the first real edition of Apicius. In 1912 Giarratano published a monograph, 'The MSS. of Caelius de re coquinaria,' and, some years later, offered to Teubner (who accepted it)

an edition of this cookery-book, presumably under this title. Giarratano did what nine out of ten editors in these days would do: he contented himself with the MSS. within reach—the ninth-century MS. in the Vatican Library, the other Italian (Renaissance) MSS. He did not cross the sea to Cheltenham, where, in a library whose door opens but to golden keys, is imprisoned another ninth-century MS. of Apicius, destined doubtless for the shelves of some dollar-king, whose freakish son will use its pages to light a

super-cigar. Indeed, he seemed unaware of its existence, though it is mentioned in Schenkl's account of English Libraries, and though Studemund (who had an inkling of U.) had already made a collation, now in the University Library at Breslau.

Luckily Vollmer intervened, Vollmer the Munich colleague of that Traube whose genius raised 'Ueberlieferungsgeschichte' to an exact science. With the help of Lehmann, Traube's successor, the whole history of the text was traced. All Renaissance MSS. are mere transcripts of the ninth-century Vatican MS. Off to limbo with them and their changeling 'Caelius'! The two ninth-century MSS. are the only foundation for an edition, if it is not designed 'for a warning to editors.' They were transcribed, at Tours and some other English settlement on the Continent, from a Fulda MS., now lost.

All that the eighth- (?) century Fulda archetype could rescue from the title-page of its uncial (?) exemplar, a MS. of the ancient world, was

API
CAE
LI,

which the Renaissance scholars expanded to *Apici Caeli* (and the last German books of reference conserve this fiction of 'Caelius who was nicknamed Apicius'). Vollmer proposes, plausibly enough, a restoration to something like

APICII ARTIS MAGIRI
CAE COMPENDII
LIBRI DECEM.

Vollmer's admirable paper in the *Bavarian Academy Proceedings* of 1920 is condensed in the short preface of this small volume. He finds in the Fulda text's exemplar a mere epitome of Apicius' manual, and ascribes its unliterary features to the fourth or fifth century epitomiser. But is he right? I cling to the idea that the Latin of a cookery-book would be unliterary Latin, and that all this mixture of Imperatives and Futures, all this Change of Subject, non-Consecution of Tenses, and what not, are original and genuine. In this manual (as in Petronius' novel) we get a glimpse at everyday Latin. Even a vulgarism like *esicium* I would not banish as Vollmer does. The seventh-century glossographers, in whom I see Donatus himself, attest it with the derivation *ab ense et secando*, i.e. 'ensis-cium,' a popular etymology which gives a clue to the pronunciation. (So Aelius Stilo's *quia petit vitam* confirms Horace's trisyllable against Catullus' affectation *pītūtā*.)

The ninety-six pages of this new gem of the Teubner series offer to us *multum in parvo*, e.g. a complete collection of the Greek papyrus fragments on Cookery, of Athenaeus' recipes, and so forth. Take it for model, ye dilettante editors. And contrast its modest preface with the flamboyant style of X, or Y, or Z.

W. M. LINDSAY.

DELPHI.

Delphi. By FREDERIK POULSEN. Translated by G. C. Richards, with a preface by Percy Gardner. Pp. x + 338, with 164 illustrations. London: Gylldendal, 1920. £1 1s.

DR. POULSEN is well known as a learned and original scholar. He has a wide knowledge, not only of classical archeology, but of classical literature as well. His book is lucid, spirited, and humane: a model, in some ways, of what a general work should be. It not only gives an excellent account of the results of French excavation at Delphi, but also endeavours to determine what

part Delphi played in Greek history, and what Delphi meant to Greece and the Greeks.

In dealing with the monuments, the author's plan is not to enumerate the objects found on the site, but to choose certain characteristic and significant pieces, and to examine them leisurely in all their bearings. The few Cretan finds are illustrated by the fragmentary rhyton: the period of Oriental influence by a Phoenician bronze bowl and an engraved shell. With the rise of Greek art proper, the selection naturally becomes more ample: for Delphi has

contributed a very great deal to our stock and knowledge of archaic sculpture. Two bronzes are effectively contrasted with the Oriental objects and with each other: one is the charming youth of Cretan style and possibly early Peloponnesian, say Sicyonian, workmanship; the other the youth with the necklace, who may be Ionian. A chapter is devoted to a sympathetic description of the metopes which are usually attributed to the Treasury of the Sicyonians: Dr. Poulsen considers that Dinsmoor may be right in ascribing them to the Syracusan Treasury. No less sympathetic is his account of the Naxian Sphinx, compared, in its decorative effect—when first erected and before Delphi became crowded with monuments—to the Lion of St. Mark at Venice; and of the early Argive statues which represent Kleobis and Biton. Dr. Poulsen rejects the Herodotean story of the brothers' end: but I take it that the main facts of the story, the prayer and the deaths, may be true, and that some such strange and solemn series of incidents seems necessary to explain the erection of the statues at Delphi.

Dr. Poulsen has already contributed to the interpretation of the 'Siphnian' frieze: and this adds interest to the present comprehensive treatment. The precise date of the frieze is in dispute, and has been discussed, since the publication of Dr. Poulsen's book, by Dr. Langlotz in his excellent work *Zur Zeitbestimmung der strengroßfigurigen Vasenmalerei und der gleichzeitigen Plastik*. Dr Poulsen seems to speak as if the date could be settled by comparison with the parapet reliefs from Ephesus: but the exact date of these is surely not established by external evidence. The sculptures of the old Temple of Apollo and of the Athenian Treasury complete the tale of archaic monumental sculpture. There are one or two slips in the chapter on the Athenian Treasury: Geryon has the usual three bodies, not two, judging by Alinari's photograph: the description of Herakles' attitude in the Cycnus metope (p. 180) is odd: surely he has the sword in his right hand and is cutting downwards from left to right: fig. 82 on

p. 186 is from a red-figured, not a black-figured, picture; the subsidiary figures, by the way, are foully restored: the crater on p. 195 is from Arezzo, not from Ruvo. I may add, that in the Siphnian pediment, Herakles is wearing a chiton only, not doublet and chiton as stated on p. 110.

At the very end of the archaic, and at the beginning of the subsequent period, comes the famous Charioteer. Professor Gardner, in his preface, calls it 'the only full-length bronze figure of fifth-century Greek art which we possess.' We have hundreds. Even if he means life-size by full-length, the statement is not true: for the Idolino is life-size. Dr. Poulsen cautiously refuses to connect the Charioteer with any of the names of sculptors which have been preserved to us: he is content to compare it, after Studniczka, with the Capranei Andumenus; and with a coin of Gela. He shows the same caution in publishing no reconstruction of the Polygnotan paintings in the Lesche: he is even over-contemptuous, I think, of such exercises.

The monument of the Thessalian Princes gives the author an opportunity of discussing the art of Lysippos: and the portraits found at Delphi form the starting-point for an interesting essay on Greek portraiture, a subject in which Dr. Poulsen has shown himself a master.

A word of praise must be accorded to Mr. Richards, who has produced a very clear and readable version. The material of the engraved shells found in Spain (p. 64) is not a land-shell, but a local shell. On p. 231, it is misleading to say that the Charioteer is 'no normal work of art': canonical would be better, though still ambiguous: what the author means is a work intended, like the Canon of Polycleitos, to embody the whole theory and achievement of the artist. Two long passages (pp. 12 and 88) purport to be quotations, since they are placed between inverted commas: but of course they are paraphrases. 'Εδπαι in *Eumenides* 11 means 'seat,' not 'seats.' On p. 243 we read 'Troy's best heroes, who lie flung away in artistic poses on the steadily rising ground.' The phrase hardly reproduces the spirit of Polygnotan painting.

The book is printed clearly, and the half-tone illustrations are nearly all good. The chief exception is the picture of the Naples Doryphoros on

p. 282, which is made from an old block, and that block from an old photograph taken before the disgusting fig-leaf was removed.

J. D. BEAZLEY.

TEXTBOOK OF ROMAN LAW.

A Textbook of Roman Law from Augustus to Justinian. By W. W. BUCKLAND, M.A., F.B.A. One vol. 9½" x 6". Pp. xiv + 756. Cambridge University Press, 1921. 50s.

IN the first place must be acknowledged the lasting debt under which the author has placed all of us who teach Roman law, and all students of Roman antiquity. Those of us who are primarily English lawyers do not always find the foreign manuals readily accessible. There is besides the important class of students who may or may not become specialists, and who probably will not, without the aid of first-rate English textbooks. There is no English textbook which will stand comparison with this, and it should find a place at once in every legal and classical library.

But Professor Buckland's work deserves to be judged by comparison with the best foreign manuals. It is not a reproduction of any well-known type, but has an original character of its own. By deliberate limitation in certain directions it is able to proceed further in another direction than any general work known to me. The limitations are logical, consistent, defensible. What is omitted is deeply interesting, and, knowing the author's competence in these matters also, one may regret, but one has no right to complain. We have a deliberate choice of a subject of the highest importance, treated the more fully and perfectly because of concentration.

Take first the limitation of period, from Augustus (or, say, Cicero) to Justinian. This is steadily, though not pedantically, observed. On the one hand, the highly speculative earlier period is eschewed: we are told to be real lawyers, studying grown-up law. On the other hand, the fascinating post-Justinian history in the West, not to mention the East, does not appear. It follows that this is no book for beginners, exhibiting the many-sided historical

significance of Roman law. What it exhibits is the full-grown Roman law in itself, acquaintance with which alone explains that significance.

Less obvious, but more remarkable, is the deliberate limitation of outlook. The Pandectist tradition is completely dropped. There is no attempt to treat Roman law as a sort of general jurisprudence or natural law, nor to fit its principles into modern systematic categories. The point of view is that of a Roman jurist of the age of the Antonines, who, by some miracle, knows the developments of the next three centuries. It is the point of view of modern writers on Roman law, but one which is more evident in monographs than—such is the force of tradition—in general works. An illustration of the author's pure Romanism is his faithful adherence to the order of the Institutes, of which no one better than he knows the weak points.

The result is an essentially legal work, giving perhaps the fullest and most detailed account of pure Roman law in its technical perfection that exists. The chosen theme is broad enough; it is the mighty technical tradition that binds Labeo to Modestinus and Tribonian, Augustus to Diocletian and Justinian; that, and, in scope and intention, nothing more. The splendid materials of the *Corpus Juris*, of which Professor Buckland is a complete master, preclude either dullness or narrowness. And it is not to be inferred that he has neglected the literary and other sources; on the contrary, he has used them with rare fullness. But when, for instance, in his preface, he says 'the subject is Private Law, and little is said of such institutions as the Colonate and the privileged and State-controlled trade corporations of later law, of which, important as they were in practice, the chief interest is social and political,' one feels that the reason for exclusion could also be expressed by

saying that these subjects came too late to become part of the great technical tradition.

It is, then, a lawyer's book. Further, it is an English lawyer's book. In reading it we breathe the professional atmosphere which Maitland's magic introduced into legal history. Everywhere the concrete application, the case; nowhere a proposition which is not a prophecy of what will hold in court. '*Causa* (in contract) means actionability and not something else independent of actionability which produces that characteristic' (p. 426). If Professor Buckland has said that before, it was worth repeating.

The work betrays the English lawyer, too, in its meticulous citation of textual authority for every statement. One feels, as one reads, that this book recaptures the very spirit of the court of the *praetor urbanus* because of a special affinity of the English legal spirit. The

value of the author's Slavery in Roman law as a guide to some of the hardest passages of the Digest is known. He now extends a helping hand through the whole *Corpus Juris*.

In the citation of literature no attempt is made to rival Girard's classical *Manuel*, to which the author acknowledges a particular obligation. But the references given are sufficient not only for a scrupulous admission of debts, but to start the reader on any special track. Towards the all-important interpolation question the author's attitude is defined with considerable caution, at least in general terms. He shows himself no bigoted conservative in detail.

To have carried a comprehensive work on this vast and difficult subject to the pitch of perfection which this book attains must have cost immense and ungrudging labour; the result deserves unstinted admiration and gratitude.

F. DE ZULUETA.

Herodotus (Loeb Classical Library). Translated by A. D. GODLEY. Vol. I.: Books 1 and 2, pp. xxi + 504. Vol. II.: Books 3 and 4, pp. xviii + 416. London: W. Heinemann. 10s. a volume.

Dr. GODLEY has given us a translation of Herodotus as nearly perfect as a translation can be. Ionic presents a difficult problem to those who wish to render its atmosphere as well as its meaning. Some translators attempt a pre-Elizabethan English, a road which generally ends in Wardour Street, and which, if it escaped this, would not lead to its goal. Are we to suppose that Hippocrates used language that corresponds to the style of Sir John Mandeville? Better are the translators who frankly use modern English; and yet Herodotus should hardly be translated into language used for Plato or Thucydides. There is no solution of the problem. Ideally an English or Scotch dialect would come nearest; and that would sound absurd. Dr. Godley has adopted a compromise between the archaists and the modernists, which may be illogical, but which achieves its end. He has a mild flavour of archaism, which never degenerates into 'tusherie,' but for the most part writes honest English. 'Aforesaid,' 'undone,' 'for the nonce,' may not be real analogies to the Ionian of Herodotus, but it is not easy to see any other way of giving the peculiar flavour of his language than by a light peppering of such phrases. The real differentia of Herodotus is his flowing *εἰρηνή*; and by preserving this, and by the purity and directness of his English, Dr. Godley has produced a translation which is not likely to be superseded.

One reflection recent issues of the Library suggest to us. For Fronto a purchaser will pay 20s.; for Herodotus, when completed, not

less than 40s. Fronto is not worth a pound, and he is not a necessity. Herodotus is a necessity, and is worth anything; but the ordinary lover of the classics can hardly afford to buy him in the Loeb series. We cannot help feeling that if the Clarendon Press can issue at the price of 7s. 6d. a book of classical essays with more than 400 pages and a number of illustrations, these translations might be produced at less than 10s. a volume. It is commercially unsound to publish books at a price at which they will find a very limited sale. And, apart from commerce, Mr. James Loeb's conception, which was worthy of its subject, will be inadequately realised until the translations that bear his name are brought within reach of the purse of the schoolmaster and the poor scholar. The future of the classics largely depends on their becoming accessible to a large public, who will thus learn what it can get from Greece and Rome. The Loeb series is admirably calculated to make them accessible, but not until it is published at, say, 5s. a volume. Even then Herodotus will cost a pound.

R. W. L.

Greek Vase-Painting. By ERNST BUSCHOR. Translated by G. C. RICHARDS, and with a Preface by PERCY GARDNER. 1 vol. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 10". Pp. xii + 110. Illustrations, 160, half-tone and black-and-white. London: Chatto and Windus, 1921. 25s.

IT is fitting that the best short sketch of Greek vase-painting should have been translated into English, and we

are grateful to the translator for having done the work; but it is a pity that the translation should not be more attractive. Buschor's little book, though by no means light reading, has been widely read in Germany, both by scholars and by those who are generally interested in Greek art. A translation should have attempted to give it a like appeal. But the English and the German reader are by no means alike, the German being gifted with far more patience and a greater capacity for reading heavy stuff than the English. The English translation should, therefore, have been above all things perspicuous. The translator of Buschor's book has, however, by keeping overconscientiously to the language of his original, sacrificed readability and perspicuity to would-be accuracy. Really, he has sacrificed accuracy too, for the original is at least German, whereas the English translation can often hardly be called English, and, therefore, cannot be said truly to be an accurate representation. No plea of accuracy can justify the following sentences: 'But the red-figured conquerors of nature, each of whom in his own way breaks through the old system of type, produce a far more differentiated effect,' or 'The emphasising of the shoulder by ornamentation is found in contrast with the lower part decorated, if at all, with stripes.' The result of this defect is likely to be that the general public will hardly have the patience to do more than look at the pictures (which, like the general production of the book, are excellent), and students well acquainted with German may prefer to consult the original. To students who know little or no German the translation will undoubtedly be very useful.

E. M. W. T.

doing it necessarily has to concern itself with general aesthetic principles. The main aesthetic thesis of the book is that art springs from a fusion of formal and representational qualities. 'From the fusion of the two aspects of a line—its purely formal value with its representational quality—arises a new thing which I call the aesthetic or artistic emotion. This new thing, which may be surprisingly intense and vivid, *is not discoverable either in the represented object per se, or in the mere formal value of the lines used*. It is a product of the fusion, often as unexpected and as novel as a chemical reaction. I admit the miracle, but I plead the fact.' This naturally leads to a discussion and condemnation of certain modern artistic tendencies to consider non-representational form capable of arousing the aesthetic emotion. Here Professor Carpenter is scarcely convincing. He says nothing of music, the least representational of the arts, or of Pater's contention that all arts strive towards the condition (that is, the non-representational condition) of music. But his assertion that 'in spite of appearances to the contrary, architecture tends to become a *representational* art, and imitates or represents a conventional world of its own creation' is interesting.

The chapters on sculpture and architecture largely concern the dimensions of which these arts make use. Professor Carpenter describes the gradual mastery of the third dimension achieved by Greek sculptors, and insists that classical Greek architecture is essentially two-dimensional in contrast with Byzantine and Gothic architecture, which are three-dimensional.

The book is well argued, and contains some acute and illuminating observations. The whole of the chapter on architecture is good, and benefits by owing a debt (duly acknowledged) to Geoffrey Scott's *Architecture of Humanism*. There is a wholesome protest against basing the aesthetics of architecture on 'materialistic tyrannies such as utility and economy,' and a plea for aesthetic judgment apart from the consideration of engineering.

A fault is that the book does not

The Aesthetic Basis of Greek Art. By RHYS CARPENTER. 1 vol. 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ "x6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii + 163. Bryn Mawr Notes and Monographs I. New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1921. \$1.50.

THIS thoughtful and stimulating little book attempts to describe the aesthetic basis of Greek art with special reference to sculpture and architecture. In so

always stick close enough to the actual works of art: theories are sometimes stated without sufficient illustration; early promises of pursuing the inductive method are not always fulfilled later.

The form of the book with the rounded corners of the cover and lines enclosing the print on the pages is unfortunate, suggesting a selection from the works of Ella Wheeler Wilcox rather than a book on Greek art.

E. M. W. T.

Manuel des Études Grecques et Latines.

Par L. LAURAND. Fascicule VII. Métrique, Sciences complémentaires. P. 142. Paris: Librairie Auguste Picard, 1919. 3.50 fr. (sewed), or 4.50 fr. (boards), each fascicule. THIS, the penultimate part of Professor Laurand's comprehensive work, has the typical merits of a French textbook. It is a model of arrangement and lucidity. The first fifty pages deal with metric: then follow fifteen on the establishment and interpretation of texts, ten on palaeography, ten on epigraphy, six on numismatics, four on archaeology, thirteen on the history of 'philologie,' seven on bibliography, and fifteen on 'le travail philologique.' There is a good index, and useful bibliographies in every chapter. The scale of the book permits of little controversy; in metric, for instance, the article 'Dactylo-épitrites' runs thus: 'Mélange de dactyles (-oo) et d'épitrites (o---, -o--, etc.): chez les lyriques et les tragiques grecs' (p. 791). But Professor Laurand has some sound introductory remarks (sceptical in tone) about modern metrical theory. A typical note is this: 'Le sens véritable du mot *énoplien* (*ἐνόπλιος*) qu'on trouve déjà dans Aristophane, n'est pas du tout connu, quoiqu'on en parle beaucoup' (p. 789). The brevity of his treatment of dactylo-épitrites has a further explanation, expressed in the following sentence: 'On s'est borné à ce qui est indispensable pour l'explication des auteurs que l'on traduit ordinairement dans les classes. Aussi a-t-on nécessairement fait la place plus large aux Latins qu'aux Grecs' (p. 745). He has indeed: not a single line of Greek

lyric poetry is quoted, against more than a hundred from Horace. One point of detail in the metrical sections may be noticed: the symbols for pauses of three and four times are wrongly printed (p. 750).

The chapter on establishment of texts is sensible, and full of useful practical hints: for instance, we find the names and addresses of photographers of MSS. in Paris, London, Vienna, and Rome, and a reference to a fuller list in the 1914 *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*. The archaeology chapter is exceedingly short, but to the point. The history of scholarship is slight, but admirably impartial; the number of French names is rather large, but geese are not turned into swans. Among English scholars Jebb is mentioned, but not Porson. The most instructive chapters are those on bibliography and 'le travail philologique,' which are very practical, and contain much valuable advice.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

The Religion of Plato. By P. E. MORE.

Pp. 352. Princeton Press. \$2.50. WE should all welcome a contribution to Platonic studies by an American scholar. The dominant philosophy in the United States is a violent revolt against Platonism; it tends to sceptical opportunism and a characteristic attempt to 'bluff' the universe. An American Platonist of high intellectual gifts might do much to correct what is superficial in American philosophy, while doing justice to the excellent work in psychology which his countrymen have achieved. Unfortunately, it is impossible to speak favourably of Mr. More's book. He is not only no metaphysician; he congratulates himself that he has never made such an 'illegitimate use of his reason.' Metaphysics, according to him, are quite unnecessary for the understanding of Plato. Plato was an uncompromising dualist; why should anyone try to find unity behind duality? He believed in divine and human personality; and we all know what a person means—someone like Zeus or Socrates. It is only 'muddy' mystifiers like Hegel and

his successors who speculate about the meaning of time and eternity. Augustine, like a sensible man, said he did not know what time is, and left it there. More than half the book consists of mere padding in the shape of long translations from the *Dialogues*. I fear the verdict must be that students of Plato will not get much help from Mr. More.

W. R. INGE.

Apollodorus: The Library. With an English translation by Sir JAMES GEORGE FRAZER, F.B.A., F.R.S. (The Loeb Classical Library.) Two vols. Small 8vo. Pp. lix + 403, 546. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1921. 10s. each vol.

SIR JAMES FRAZER'S translation of Apollodorus is worthy of his acknowledged skill in the translator's art. Pedantry may notice a very few infelicities. 'Iambe joked the goddess,' though the usage has some support in eighteenth-century writers of Scottish extraction, is harsh to English ears. 'The abandoned boy' (*ό παῖς ἀπολειφθεῖς*), though an illustration of the ambiguities of our language, is correct, but 'he did not miss, neither with the bow nor with the javelin,' represents the Greek, not the English idiom. The translation of *eis τὰ ἄρθρα* (III. xv. 1) spares the modesty of the Greekless reader, but may mislead him as to the meaning (*cf.* Herodotus, III. 8, 7, and IV. 2, 5). The story is a curious variant of the theme of Tobias and Sara.

In the notes, the implication that Myconus is a small island as compared with Delos (Vol. II., p. 247) is misleading, and 'fairyland forlorn' (Vol. II., p. 288) is a most unhappy emendation. But even Homer nods. As a whole the translation is clear, accurate, and pleasant to read.

The commentary, however, is disappointing. The notes consist mainly of lists of classical references by which the Greekless reader cannot profit, while to the classical scholar, with Roscher to his hand, they are a convenience rather than a necessity. For there is too little comment upon the relative merits of the passages, and the problems which should be raised are often missed or omitted. Little space has been found for archaeological evidence either as a commentary upon the veracity of legendary history or as a supplement to Greek mythology. The practices of Greek cult are ignored. Farnell is not once mentioned, and of recent specialist literature only the works of A. B. Cook and Rendel Harris receive considerable attention. There are no adequate notes upon the kind of problems with which T. W. Allen deals. To the folklore notes the customs of the Lower Culture contribute disproportionately as compared with the folklore and folktales of Europe, which are more germane to the study of Apollodorus; and there is little attempt in the notes to analyse the elements of myth, legend, and

folktale, which are admirably distinguished in the introduction.

No doubt limits of space have cramped an artist accustomed to working upon a larger canvas, but room for more essential things might have been made by the omission of irrelevant matter. For example, Appendix II. is really irrelevant; Appendix III. is shortly to be published in another form; Appendix VII. adds little to the author's note on Pausanias IX. 5, 10, of which it is largely a repetition. The printing in Appendix XIII. of thirty-six previously published variants of the tale of Polyphemus seems of doubtful utility, and it is characteristic that Hackman's examination of the distribution of the story is mentioned, but not its result, viz. that an Indian origin appears to be out of the question.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

Short Texts from Coptic Ostraca and Papyri.

Edited and indexed by W. E. CRUM. Pp. xii + 150. Oxford University Press, 1921. 16s. net.

THIS collection, containing texts from some thirty sources, is of the nature of raw material for Mr. Crum's great Coptic dictionary now in the making. Most of them are from the Theban district and of the sixth to the eighth centuries.

This is not the place to discuss the many interesting points of Coptic lexicography and grammar to be found among them, nor the relationship of some of them with literary Coptic texts known elsewhere; but there are one or two of them which should be noted by the Greek scholar, and so suitable for mention in the *Classical Review*.

No. 410 is the opening words of Psalm 67 (68) in Greek—

αναστήτησο ο Θεος και
διοσκορ[πισθητωσ
απέκτηρ[αυτου και
φευκευτωσαν βαντ[ες
[ο]ι μισουντης
αιτων απο προσωπουν
αυτου [ως εκ]λαμπι και

In l. 4 *πάντες* [*βαντες*] is not found in any other authority; but the generally illiterate type of text (*e.g.* *εκτηρ* for *έχθροι*) forbids the variant to be regarded very seriously.

Several of the texts are of the nature of vocabularies—explanations of Greek words by their Coptic equivalents (*e.g.* 167 *ἀρτοκόλλιον*, 402 *μεφερεταριος*, *παγρικιος*, *έξκουβιτωρ*, etc.), though the Coptic explanations are often either missing or inaccurate. There is one of definitely literary¹ interest. No. 403 reads as follows :

¹ Pagan allusions or reminiscences (literary) are curiously rare in Coptic. I can recall an allusion to Aristophanes in the sermons of Shenoute, and there is a vocabulary in the British Museum (probably the property and possibly the autograph composition of the poet Dioscorus—some day, I hope, to be published by Mr. Bell) which mentions Anacreon. I know nothing otherwise.

νυμφε απρικος ον
κ αχι παρρησια
ουδέεετ αυτορπο
μεντι . . τ[

And this has been identified by Mr. Edgar Lobel as Menander *Monost.* 371 (Meineke) :

νύμφη δ' ἄπροκος οὐκ ἔχει παρρήσιαν

The second Coptic word is corrupt and doubtful. Mr. Lobel suggests that it may be meant for *επαντορποσ*, and be due to a confusion of *ἄπροκος* with *ἀπρίξ*; but I am hardly satisfied.

S. GASELEE.

Der Indogermanische Vokalismus (=Indogermanische Grammatik, Teil II.), [Indogermanische Bibliothek, Erste Abteilung, Erste Reihe, 13. 2]. By HERMANN HIRT. Onevol. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xi + 256. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1921. 7s. (M. 20; bound, M. 26).

DESCRIBED in the preface as a second edition of the author's *Ablaut*, this work is to be followed by the remaining volumes of a four-volume *Indogermanische Grammatik*. The treatment is fuller than in the first edition, because, although space has been saved by limiting the citation of material for the well-known problems and by the use of smaller type, modifications in the working out of the theory have been introduced and defended at some length. Brugmann and Osthoff are repeatedly accused, perhaps less justly than the accuser thinks, of having led the world astray. The well-known merits of Hirt's earlier work are to be found here also, but so are its defects, and with this reservation the book may be recommended to the critical reader.

R. MCKENZIE.

Einführung in das Studium der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der klassischen und germanischen Sprachen, übersetzt von Walter Fischer (Indogermanische Bibliothek, I. 1. 14.). By JOS. SCHRIJNEN. One vol. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ " x 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x + 340. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1921. 7s. (M. 20; bound, M. 28).

THIS translation of Schrijnen's *Handleiding bij de Studie der Vergelijkende Indogermanische Taalwetenschap* (Leiden, 1917) introduces to the German-reading public a work which is of value chiefly as containing a very full bibliography of recent publications bearing on general linguistics, including researches on general phonetics and on the social and psychological aspects of language. It seeks to give also a survey of the results, but the effect is a little bewildering, and the suspicion arises that not all these researches deserve to be treated with so much respect as the author accords to them. The later part of the book is a sketch of Indo-European phonology, which will be found useful, though not free from errors in detail (such as Lesbian *ξίννος*, p. 232).

R. MCKENZIE.

Greek Papyri from Gurob. By J. G. SMYLY. (Royal Irish Academy, Cunningham Memoirs, XII.) Two plates. 1921. 12s. 6d.

THESE skilfully edited texts, twenty-nine in number, form a small appendix to the Petrie Papyri, having come from the same site, and sometimes dealing with identical circumstances; in one instance further fragments are obtained of a document already published. The best piece is No. 1, a fragment, written early in the third century B.C., of a mystery-ritual, in prose, but evidently including numerous hexameter verses. Unfortunately it is in poor preservation, and the particular cult concerned is not clearly determined. Orphic characteristics are, perhaps, most pronounced, though affinities with other systems are traceable. As Professor Smyly remarks, we may infer that either the process of contamination had already made much progress, or the different cults had from the first a large element in common. No. 2, giving a partial second copy of a legal decision, of which a very illegible duplicate was printed in P. Petrie, Vol. III., places that juristically interesting text on a new basis. The remainder are business papers of the usual type. No. 22, besides mentioning shrines of Nephthymis (cf. P. Hibeh 27. 86, Wilcken Archiv IV., p. 180) and Sachmis (a correct form, here first found in Greek), attests a shrine of Mithras in the Fayûm in the early Ptolemaic period.

A. S. H.

De Papyro Oxyrhynchita 1380. By B. A. VAN GRONINGEN. Pp. 84. To be obtained of the author, Leeuwarden, Holland. 3s.

THIS doctoral thesis examines carefully the elaborate invocation of Isis in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. XI., pp. 190 ff., from the point of view that it is essentially an Egyptian document written in Greek, and that its origin and parallels to it are to be found in Egyptian religious sources rather than in the Hellenistic remains of the Isis-cult of the first two centuries, which have come down to us in some quantity. Mr. van Groningen's thesis appears to be justified, and he has used his parallels (e.g. the invocation to Isis in Apuleius, *Met.* Book XI.) with intelligence.

The first part of the invocation rehearses the forms and attributes with which Isis, πολυώνυμος and πολύμορφος, is worshipped at different centres, both within and outside Egypt (e.g. 'at

Paphos, hallowed, divine, gentle; in Chios, marching; at Salamis, observer; in Cyprus, all-bounteous; in Chalcidice, holy; . . .'). Mr. van Groningen's comment on l. 95 οὐ . . . Πύργῳ Ἐλλάδα, ἀγαθήν, where he thinks Ἐλλάδα to be some form of the Semitic *al-elat*, the goddess, does not seem to be very satisfactory, for if among the Persians (l. 104) Isis could be venerated as *Latina*, she might well have the style of *Greece* at Pyrgos, and other identifications with purely Semitic deities in this long list seem to be absent.

The whole is a careful piece of work, and deserves the attention of those who investigate the Eastern religions which seemed for a time likely to be the rivals of Christianity.

S. G.

Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion. By JANE ELLEN HARRISON, Hon. D.Litt., etc. Cambridge, 1921. THIS little book of forty pages is for the most part a summary of the theories and suggestions with which the readers of Miss Harrison's earlier works are familiar, and as such it does not call for a long review. As regards the religion of Greece it contains little or nothing fresh, and the reader will find that Miss Harrison is quite impenitent in regard to some of her earlier suggestions, which seem to be highly disputable; but the convenience and interest of such a summary is obvious, and scholars may well be grateful to Miss Harrison for the

frankness with which she explains what are partly the conclusions of her work, but partly (one may suspect) the pre-suppositions of it.

It is nearly ten years since the publication of *Themis*. The soil from which that volume sprang was in a great measure provided by the writings of Durkheim, in the light of which many of the records of Greek religion were interpreted. This soil has now received a top-dressing, compounded mainly of the psychology of Freud and Jung, and the writings of Soloviev; and the writer's theory of the general nature of religion, and especially of theistic religion, has been somewhat amplified, or at least re-expressed, accordingly; but the criticism of this theory, which (to the reviewer) appears to leave out of account some of the most important aspects of the religious life, whether ancient or modern, is not a task which falls within the scope of the *Classical Review*. It is sufficient to say that Miss Harrison still writes with all the charm and all the provocativeness which have always characterised her work, and that she succeeds in putting into a few pages a theory which it would take many pages to discuss adequately.

A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE HOMERIC CATALOGUE, 852-5.

I APPEAR to have set a booby-trap for Mr. Leaf (*C.R.*, 1922, 52 ff.). Not intentionally, but a booby-trap. My Apparatus Criticus on B 852 ff. has got into print with several errors.¹ The words '852-5 non legerunt Eratosthenes et Apollodorus' should read '853-5' and stand at line 853; 'κοβιδίλον κρώμαν τε καὶ ὑδέντα κίτωρον Apollodorus ap. Strab.' should read 'κρωβιδίλον κρώμαν τε καὶ ὑδέντα κίτωρον Apollonius ipse l.c.';² 'κρώμαν Zen. Eu. 147. 28' should read 'κρώμαν Zonar. 147. 28.' Therefore Mr. Leaf's observations from 'But Mr Allen' p. 55 to the end of his article go out, and if he wishes to contest my argument (set out without clerical error on pp. 156-9 of my book) that his idea of there having been

commerce in the heroic age between the Aegean and the Euxine by a sea-route is fiddle-de-dee, he must begin again.

I regret that I omitted to quote Mr. Leaf's 'J' ('my Bm4') for κρώμαν. The note in my forthcoming edition goes 'κρώμαν Bm4 P1 Zonar. 147. 28 κρωμάν W3' I hope I have done right. Should I have added 'teste Leaf'? Of the same MS. J (Bm4) Mr. Leaf asserted (*Journal of Philology*, 1892, p. 242) that it read τερυχήσις at P748; he imposed on Ludwich and on me in the first Oxford edition. He omitted the statement in his own second edition. So between Mr. Leaf in the article and Mr. Leaf in the edition the reader was at sea. This is unimportant, but it shows that the Genius of Error inspires the just as well as the unjust.

T. W. ALLEN.

HYMN. HERM. 109-14.

MR. H. P. CHOLMELEY'S note (*C.R.*, 1922, p. 14) is not helpful. He has quite overlooked one fundamental fact. The marvellous infant

¹ There are errata in other places too: v. 520 *dele* 'V1V5'; v. 523 read 'Ptol. Pamphil.'; v. 711 after 'cf. 734' read 713, the number of the next line.

² The readings stand correctly in the third Oxford edition (1919).

scarcely a day old can do easily a great deal that he himself, whatever his physical powers may be, could not possibly perform, however 'hot' he made himself. There is no question of using either a bow- or a spindle-drill, nor is there anything to lead us to suppose that Hermes held the *storeus* with his feet or in a vice. Of course, if the reading of Messrs. S. and A. which makes him hold it in hand be approved, the case is different. I dissented from that view, as, it is evident, does Mr. C.

Of my 'notions upon the process of producing fire by a fire-stick' he is not qualified to speak. They have never been stated for the simple reason that such a statement, like that made by Mr. C. himself, could be of no possible use for the purpose in view.

If he supposes that *σιδήρως* is a reading introduced by me or for which I have some responsibility, he is again in error. It comes, 'absurd' or not, from the tradition. I stated the only possible translation of *ἐνίαλλε* (or *ἐνίλλε*) *σιδήρως*, and went on to suggest that the word might be a later perversion, a needless metrical correc-

tion, of *στροφῆ*. Hermann feeling the same difficulty proposed *σιδεῖως*.

T. L. AGAR.

ANIMALS IN ROME.

MR. GEORGE JENNISON, F.Z.S., writes from the Zoological Gardens, Bellevue, Manchester, to ask whether any reader can quote a price, actual or comparative, made for a wild animal in or for Rome or the Roman Empire. The only reference he can find is in Apuleius, where a tip of ten aurei was given to the servants who brought the 'bear.'

THE PRICE OF FOREIGN BOOKS.

MR. F. T. RICKARDS writes from 25, Corfton Road, Ealing, W. 5, to ask whether readers can tell him how to obtain foreign books at prices corresponding to the rate of exchange. We have no doubt that many booksellers are now aware that the best policy is to allow readers the benefit of the abnormal exchanges, but we mention, honoris causa, the firm of Birrell and Garnett, Gerrard Street, W.C., in this matter.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL WEEKLY (NEW YORK). (1922.)

HISTORY.—May 22. Marion E. Park, *The Plebs in Cicero's Day* (T. A. Miller). Highly praised, in contrast to the majority of doctorate theses, as a sound and readable treatise on the origin and employment of the lower classes.

LITERATURE.—Apr. 24. Eleanor S. Duckett, *Hellenistic Influence on the Aeneid* (Gertrude Hirst). The first of a series of Smith College classical studies. 'A useful assemblage of material.'—May 8. J. A. K. Thomson, *Greeks and Barbarians* (G. B. Gulick). Praised as fresh and stimulating.

METRIC.—May 15. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Griechische Verskunst* (L. H. Baker). 'The importance of the work cannot be overestimated; but it would have been better to begin all over again and build a new system of metrical science.' Reviewer distrusts mere metrical analysis, and pleads for a recognition of the emotional appeal of Greek lyrics.

The issues for April 17, May 1, and May 8 contain lists of articles (some of them important) on classical subjects in non-classical periodicals.

LE MUSÉE BELGE.

(JULY AND OCTOBER, 1921.)

ARCHAEOLOGY.—J. P. Walzing summarises F. Quilling's *Die Jupiter-Säule des Samus und Severus: das Denkmal in Mainz*. This is an account of the sculptured column discovered in fragments at Mainz in 1904, originally erected in the reign of Nero by the

canabarii of the camp there.—A letter from M. C. Ténékides gives an account of excavations at sites in Ionia, chiefly Nysa and Clazomenae.

AUTHORS.—*Horace*: J. Hardy argues for 'pavidus futuri' in *Ars Poet.* 172.—*Minucius Felix*: J. P. Walzing discusses again the priority of Minucius and Tertullian, and argues that it is T. who has borrowed from M., as he borrowed from all the Greek Apologetic writers of the second century.—*Virgil*: J. Herbeaux argues that in *Eclologue* VIII. 17 and 50 ff. V. is indebted to Meleager.

CULTS.—J. Herbillon discusses the meaning of the title *Λαύφια* given to Artemis.—G. Dossin gives extracts from his dissertation on the cult of Trophonius at Lebadea.

STYLISTIC.—E. Merchie writes on the *Clausula* in Sidonius Apollinaris.

MARCH, 1922.

AUTHORS.—*Arrian*. J. Meunier discusses the sources of the *Ινδική* of Arrian, and differs from Müller and from Schwartz in Pauly-Wiss.—*Homer*: A. Delatte analyses with approval E. Drerup's *Homerische Poetik*, 1 Band : *das Homerproblem in der Gegenwart: Prinzipien und Methoden der Homerklärung*.

INSCRIPTIONS.—J. P. Walzing continues his papers on *Latin Inscriptions in Roman Belgium*.

LEXICOGRAPHY.—J. H. Baxter, of Ballantrae, gives two pages of *Corrigenda et Addenda Thesauro Linguae Latinae*.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR DAS KLAS-
SISCHE ALTERTUM, ETC. (ILBERG).

1922.

(XLX./L., 1/2 AND 3).

ART.—1/2. Anton Springer, *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*. I. Das Altertum. II. Auf. Nach Adolf Michaelis bearbeitet von Paul Wolters. Mit 1038 Abbildungen im Text und 12 Farbendrucktafeln [Leipzig, Alfred Kröner, 1920. 559 S. Geb. M. 100].—Wilhelm Lübbe, *Grundriss der Kunstgeschichte*. I. Die Kunst des Altertums. 15 Aufl. Vollständig neu bearbeitet von Erich Pernice. Mit 14 Kunstbeilagen und 664 Abbildungen im Text [Esslingen a. N., Paul Neff (Max Schreiber), 1921. 428 S. Geb. M. 68] (H. L. Ulrichs). Both books highly praised, but many of the illustrations severely criticised, especially the coloured plates. U. disputes many of Wolters' views.

HISTORY.—3. Friedrich Bilabel, *Die ionische Kolonisation*. Untersuchungen über die Gründungen der Ionier, deren staatliche und kulturelle Organisation und Beziehungen zu den Mutterstädten. [Leipzig, Dieterichsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1920. IV., 260 S. M. 33.60.] (W. Judeich). Disproportionate space given to Miletus, and other faults of method, but very valuable, especially in detail.

GREEK LITERATURE.—1/2. Franz Dornseiff, *Pindars Stil*. [Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1921. 134 S. 8°. M. 12].—Ders., *Pindar, übersetzt und erläutert* [Leipzig, Inselverlag, 1921. 262 S. 8°. M. 45] (E. Bethe). Both warmly praised, especially the first. The translation is in prose.

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.
(MARCH—MAY, 1922.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—O. Maass, *Platons Staat* [Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1921, Velhagen and Klasing. Text pp. xxxvi+268, Commentary pp. 298] (Seeliger). New school edition, with well-written introduction and useful commentary; Greek texts full of misprints and considerable portions not included. Reviewer adds several corrections.

LATIN LITERATURE.—C. J. Hidén, *De genitivo Lucretiano* [Helsingfors, 1920] (Orth). Completes H.'s *De causum syntaxi Lucretiana*, of which I. and II. appeared in 1896 and 1899; well arranged and thorough; full index.—R. Heinze, *Q. Horatius Flaccus, erklärt von Ad. Klessing. Dritter Teil: Satiren*, 5 Aufl. [Berlin, 1921, Weidmann. Pp. 347] (Rosenberg). This new edition has become almost entirely the work of H. Extensive changes, especially in Sat. II., 2-6; the editor's learning and sober judgment are equally amazing.—Fr. Dannemann, *Plinius und seine Naturgeschichte in ihrer Bedeutung für die Gegenwart* [Jena, 1921, Diederichs. Pp. 251] (A. Klotz). Reviewer complains of many inaccuracies and of the haphazard selection of extracts, but welcomes the recognition by modern science of the value of classical writers.

HISTORY.—T. Petersson, *Cicero, a biography* [Berkeley, 1920. University of California Press. Pp. iii+699] (A. Klotz). A much truer picture than Mommsen's caricature; in particular his account of Cicero as a politician is completely satisfactory. In spite of small blemishes this biography ranks in a class by itself.—F. H. Cowles, *Gaius Verres, an historical study* [Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, XX., 1917. Pp. v+207] (A. Klotz). Good and clear survey.—K. Sethe, *Demotische Urkunden zum ägyptischen Bürgerschaftsrecht vorzüglich der Ptolemaierzeit* [Abhandl. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. XXXII. Leipzig, 1920. Teubner. Pp. vi+812. 68 plates] (Otto). A monumental work; the first part contains texts, translation, unusually full commentary and grammatical notes. The second (legal) part by Partsch is no less exemplary.—J. Kromayer, *Drei Schlachten aus dem griechisch-römischen Altertum* [Abhandl. Sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. XXXIV. Leipzig, 1921, Teubner. 6 maps] (Lehmann). Reviewer criticises and discusses at length K.'s account of Marathon and the Allia; he agrees with K.'s site of the Caudine Forks. Excellent maps.

PHILOSOPHY.—K. Joel, *Geschichte der antiken Philosophie*, Band I. [Tübingen, 1921, Mohr. Pp. xvi+990] (Seeliger). A stimulating book, with plentiful but not always reliable references. Reviewer criticises and disagrees freely.—E. Horneffer, *Der junge Platon*, I. Teil: *Sokrates und die Apologie* [Giessen, 1922, Töpelmann. Pp. iv+170] (Seeliger). Reviewer agrees generally with H.'s belief in the historical accuracy of the *Apology*, but less with his conclusions about the religious nature of Socrates.—K. Reinhardt, *Posidonios* [München, 1921, Beck. Pp. 475] (Nestle). An enormous advance in our knowledge and understanding of Posidonius; but in order to establish his belief in P.'s dynamic monism R. is too ruthless in his treatment of tradition.—P. Friedländer, *Der grosse Alcibiades ein Weg zu Platon* [Bonn, 1921, Cohen. Pp. 51] (Nestle). F.'s attempt to vindicate the authenticity of this dialogue is unsuccessful.

PHILOLOGY.—A. C. Juret, *Manuel de Phonétique latine* [Paris, 1921, Hachette. Pp. 390] (Niedermann). Falls far short of Sommer's exemplary *Handbuch* (2nd ed., 1914), though occasionally Juret corrects the results of previous research; bibliography far from complete.—H. Güntert, *Von der Sprache der Götter und Geister* [Halle, 1921, Niemeyer. Pp. vi+183] (K. F. W. Schmidt). First section deals with language of magic, second and third with that of the gods in Homer and in the *Eddas*; interesting and warmly recommended to classical teachers.—J. Schrijnen, *Einführung in das Studium der indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der klassischen und germanischen Sprachen*. Übers. von W. Fischer [Heidelberg, 1921, Winter. Pp. x+340] (Hermann). On the whole successful; the general section is best, and is particularly suited to serve as an introduction to the sub-

ject.—Fr. Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte. Erster Band: Der lesbische, thessalische, böotische, arkadische und kyprische Dialekt* [Berlin, 1921, Weidmann. Pp. vi+477] (Hermann). The work of a master and a sure guide through inextricable difficulties; in addition to phonology and morphology B. deals fully with word-formation, syntax, vocabulary, and names of persons and places.—B. Linderbauer, *S. Benedicti Regula Monachorum* [Metten, 1922, Benediktinerstift] (A. Klotz). Very valuable contribution to our knowledge of Latin in sixth century, A.D.

MYTHOLOGY.—*Athena Tritogenija i atički Tri-topatreji* [Glasnik zem. Museja XXXII. Sarajevo, 1920] (Radermacher). Reviewer

summarises at some length this etymological and mythological examination of the *Trito*-group of deities.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—G. Rodenwaldt, *Der Fries des Megaron von Mykenai* [Halle, 1921, Niemeyer. Pp. viii+72. One coloured plate, 4 supplementary plates, and 30 figures] (Karo). Ingenious reconstruction of frescoes at Mycenae from very fragmentary remains; well illustrated.—C. Watzinger and K. Wulzinger, *Damaskus. Die antike Stadt* [Berlin, 1921, de Gruyter and Co. Pp. viii+112. One plate, 2 maps, 85 illustrations] (Thomassen). First systematic survey of Damascus, resulting in recovery of plan of the ancient trading city; valuable preliminary work on promising site.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.
** Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Appleton (R. B.) *The Elements of Greek Philosophy. From Thales to Aristotle.* 8"×5". Pp. xiv+170. London : Methuen, 1922. 6s. net.
- Arnaldi (F.) *Le Idee Politiche Morali e Religiose di Tacito.* 9½"×6⅓". Pp. 75. Rome : Typografica Salesiana, 1912.
- Bailey (C.) *Lucreti De Rerum Natura Libri Sex.* 8"×5". Oxford : University Press, 1922. Second Edition. 5s. net.
- Boëthius (A.) *Der Argivische Kalender.* 10"×6". Pp. iv+76. Uppsala University, 1922.
- Botsford (G. W.) *Hellenic History.* 9"×6". Pp. 520. New York : The Macmillan Company, 1922. 18s. net.
- Bradley (H.) *On the Text of Abbo of Fleury's 'Quaestiones Grammaticales.'* 10"×6". Pp. 8. Oxford : University Press, 1922. 1s. net.
- Casson (S.) *Ancient Greece.* 7½"×5". Pp. 96. Oxford : University Press, 1922. 2s. 6d. net.
- Classical Philology.* Vol. XVII., No. 3, July, 1922. 9½"×6¼". Pp. 187-282. Chicago : University Press.
- Classical Philology.* Vol. XVIII., No. 2, April, 1922. Pp. 97-186. Chicago : University Press.
- Cook (A. S.) *The Possible Begetter of the Old English Beowulf and Widith.* Vol. XXV. Pp. 281-346. Yale : University Press ; New Haven : Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, April, 1922.
- Cookson (G. M.) *Four Plays of Aeschylus.* 7½"×5". Pp. 212. Oxford : Blackwell, 1922. 4s. 6d. net.
- Cumont (F.) and Bidey (I.) *Juliani Epistulae et Leges.* 8"×5¼". Pp. xxvi+328. Paris : Société d'Édition les Belles Lettres ; Oxford : University Press, 1922. Paper, 11s. net ; cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Delatte (A.) *Essai sur la Politique Pythagoricienne.* 9"×6". Pp. xii+296. Fascicule XXIX. Paris : E. Champion, 1922.
- Diack (F. C.) *The Newton Stone and other Pictish Inscriptions.* 8"×5¼". Pp. 64. Paisley : Alexander Gardner, 1922.
- Dornseiff (F.) *Das Alphabet in Mystik und Magie.* 9½"×6⅓". Pp. 176. Berlin : B. G. Teubner, 1922.
- Eitrem (S.) and Fridrichsen (A.) *Ein christliches Amulett auf Papyrus.* 9½"×6⅓". Pp. 32. Christiania : J. Dybwad, 1921.
- Ernle (S.) *The Wrath of Achilles.* Translated from the *Iliad* into Quantitative Hexameters. 9½"×7½". Pp. 136. Oxford : University Press, 1922. 10s. net.
- Fiesel (Dr. E.) *Das grammatische Geschlecht im Etruskischen.* 10"×6½". Pp. 160. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1922. 5s.
- Forbes (H. O.) *The Topography of Caesar's Last Campaign against the Bellovacii.* Published in the *Geographical Journal.* Vol. LIX. No. 3, March, 1922. London : The Royal Geographical Society. 2s.
- Franklin (A. M.) *The Lupercalia.* 10"×6". Pp. 106. New York : Columbia University, 1922.
- Gaultier (J. de) *La Philosophie Officielle et la Philosophie.* 7½"×4¾". Pp. xiv+158. Paris : Félix Alcan, 1922. Fr. 7 net.
- Graves (C. L.) *New Times and Old Rhymes.* 8"×5¼". Pp. 128. Oxford : Blackwell, 1921. 6s. net.
- Groeneboom (P.) *Les Mimiambes d'Hérodas I-VI.* 10"×6½". Pp. 196. Groningen : P. Noordkoff, 1922. F. 2.50.
- Gsell (S.) *Inscriptions Latines de l'Algérie.* 16½"×11¼". Pp. xvi+458. Paris : Honoré Champion, 1922.
- Harden (J. M.) *Psalterium Iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi.* 9"×5¾". Pp. xxxii+196. London : S.P.C.K., New York and Toronto : The Macmillan Co., 1922. 10s. net.

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

- Headlam (W.)** Herodas: The Mimes and Fragments (completed by A. D. Knox). 9" x 5½". Pp. lxiv + 466. Cambridge: University Press, 1922. 63s. net.
- Heitland (W. E.)** The Roman Fate. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 80. Cambridge: University Press, 1922. 3s. net.
- Herfst (P.)** Le Travail de la Femme dans la Grèce Ancienne. 8½" x 6". Pp. 122. Utrecht: A. Oosthoek, 1922.
- Holleaux (M.)** Rome: La Grèce et les Monarchies Hellénistiques. 10" x 6½". Pp. iv + 386. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1921.
- Inge (W. R.)** Essays by Divers Hands, being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature. 9" x 5½". Pp. x + 152. Oxford: University Press, 1922. 7s. net.
- Joachim (H. H.)** Aristote. 9½" x 5½". Pp. xxxviii + 302. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922. 32s. net.
- Kunst (Dr. K.)** Die Frauengestalten im Attischen Drama. 10" x 7". Pp. viii + 200. Wien und Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1922.
- Lavagnini (B.)** Le Origini del Romanzo Greco. 10" x 6¾". Pp. 104. Pisa: F. Mariotti, 1921.
- L'Esame.** Rivista Mensile di Cultura e d'Arte. First year. First two parts. 10" x 7". Milan: Società Anonima. L. 5 per number.
- Lietzmann (H.)** Schallanalyse und Textkritik. Tübingen: Mohr, 1922. M. 15.
- Lindsay (W. M.)** Julian of Toledo: De Vitis et Figuris. 8½" x 5½". Pp. 42. Oxford: University Press, 1922. 2s. 6d. net.
- Loeb Library: Butler (H. E.)** Quintilian III. Pp. viii + 596. Quintilian IV. Pp. vi + 550.
- Wright (W. C.)** Philostratus and Eunapius. Pp. xliii + 596. Magie (D.) The Scriptores Historiae Augustae. Pp. xxxviii + 494.
- Edmonds (J. M.)** Lyra Graeca I. Pp. xvi + 460. London: Heinemann, 1922. 6¾" x 4¼". 10s. net.
- Marvin (F. S.)** Western Races and the World. 9" x 6½". Pp. 264. Oxford: University Press, 1922. 12s. 6d. net.
- Matheson (P. E.)** The Growth of Rome. 7½" x 5". Pp. 96. Oxford: University Press, 1922. 2s. 6d. net.
- Merrill (E. T.)** Piny's Letters, Books I.-X. 10" x 6½". Pp. xxiv + 315. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1922. Paper, 9.6os.; cloth, 12s.
- Miller (S. N.)** The Roman Fort at Balmuildy on the Antonine Wall. 9" x 7". Pp. xx + 120. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1922. 21s. net.
- Morton (W. C.)** S. P. E. Tract No. IX. The Language of Anatomy. 9" x 6". Pp. 28. Oxford: University Press, 1922.
- Novum Testamentum Latine.** Part II. Fasc. I. Revised by H. J. White. 11½" x 9". Pp. 153 + 278. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.
- Orlando (M.)** Spigolature Glottologiche. Part I. 8½" x 6½". Pp. 21. Palermo: G. Petrotta, 1922. L. 2.50.
- Pearson (A. C.)** Verbal Scholarship and the Growth of some Abstract Terms. 7½" x 5". Pp. 50. Cambridge: University Press, 1922. 2s. 6d. net.
- Perdrizet (P.)** Negotium Perambulans in Tenebris (Études de Demonologie Gréco-Oriental). 10" x 6½". Pp. 38. Oxford: University Press for the University of Strasbourg, 1922. 1s. 6d. net.
- Perry (B. E.)** The Metamorphoses ascribed to Lucius of Patrae: Its Content, Nature, and Authorship. 9" x 6". Pp. vi + 74. New York: G. E. Stechert, 1920. \$1.00.
- Photographs of Manuscripts.** Reports from His Majesty's Representatives Abroad respecting Facilities for obtaining Photographs of Manuscripts in Public Libraries in certain Foreign Countries. 9½" x 6". Pp. 28. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1922. 1s. net.
- Proceedings of the Classical Association of Scotland.** 7½" x 6". Pp. 72. Edinburgh: Pillans and Wilson, 1922.
- Rostertzeff (M.)** A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C. (A Study in Economic History.) 10" x 6½". Pp. x + 210. Madison: University of Wisconsin Studies, 1922. \$2.00.
- Singer (C.)** Greek Biology and Greek Medicine. 7½" x 5". Pp. 128. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922. 2s. 6d. net.
- Stocks (J. L.)** De Coelo. 9" x 6". Pp. vi + 268-338. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922. 10s. net.
- Stoltz (Dr. F.)** Geschichte der lateinischen Sprache. 6½" x 4". Pp. 132. Berlin and Leipzig: B. W. Berleger, 1922.
- The Journal of Roman Studies.** Vol. X. Part I. 1920. 11" x 7½". Pp. 102. London: The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
- Thiel (J. H.)** Σενοφῶντος Πύρων. Doctor's thesis. 9½" x 7½". Pp. xxvi + 57. University of Amsterdam, 1922.
- Tidner (E.)** De Particulis Copulativis apud Scriptores Historiae Augustae Quaestiones Selectae. 10" x 6½". Pp. xli + 146. Uppsala: University Press, 1922.
- Virgil.** A Biography, by Tenney Frank. Pp. vi + 200. Oxford: Blackwell, 1922. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Vorndran (Dr. L.)** Die Aristocrate des Demosthenes als Advokatenrede und ihre politische Tendenz. 9" x 6". Pp. 68. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1922.
- Westaway (K. M.)** The Educational Theory of Plutarch. 8½" x 5½". Pp. xii + 242. University of London Press, 1922. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Woodward (Rev. G. R.)** Hymns of the Greek Church. 10" x 6". Pp. 40. London: S.P.C.K. New York and Toronto: The Macmillan Co., 1922. 2s. net.
- Wüst (E.)** Vom Wert der alten Sprachen für die Ausbildung unserer Jugend. 9" x 5½". Pp. 16. University of Würzburg.
- Zimmern (A. E.)** The Greek Commonwealth. Third Edition. 9½" x 5¾". Pp. 462. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922. 16s. net.

ans in
Gréco-
xford :
city of

ibed to
re, and
y York;

om His
pecting
Manu-
Foreign
: H.M.

f Scot-
Pillans

ypt in
Econo-
Madi-
, 1922.

Medi-
rendon

. vi +
1922.

ischen
and

Part I,
The
studies.
ctor's
iversity

apud
tiones
psala:

Pp.
Cloth,

emos-
tische
born :

Theory
Uni-
Cloth,

Greek
P.C.K.
millan

en für
x 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".

health.
ford :